943679

NCMC
Ref
BS
1965
1897
v.4

THE EXPOSITOR'S

GREEK TESTAMENT

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR," "THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE," ETC.

VOLUME IV.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

LONDON MCMX

EX LIBRIS

JOHN WALTERS

THE EXPOSITOR'S

GREEK TESTAMENT

I

THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS

BY

JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.

II

THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY

AND

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS

BY

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D.

III

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON

BY

W. E. OESTERLEY, M.A., B.D.

IV

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

BY

MARCUS DODS, D.D.

V

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES

BY

W. E. OESTERLEY, M.A., B.D.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

LONDON MCMX

THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES OF PAUL THE APOSTLE

TO THE

THESSALONIANS

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *The Mission to Thessalonica.*—The Christian inhabitants of Thessalonica were mainly Greeks by birth and training (i. 9, *cf.* ii. 14; Acts xiv. 15, xv. 19), who had been won over from paganism by the efforts of Paul, Silvanus (Silas), and Timotheus (Timothy), during an effective campaign which lasted for a month or two. It had opened quietly with a three weeks' mission in the local synagogue. Luke, who by this time had left the trio, enters into no details about its length or methods, adding merely that some of the Jews believed, while a host of devout Greeks and a considerable number of the leading women threw in their lot with the apostles. Luke is seldom interested in the growth or fortunes of individual churches. But, as the subsequent membership of the church, its widespread influence and fame, its inner condition, and the resentment caused by the success of the Pauline mission (continued from the house of Jason, Acts xvii. 5) all imply, a considerable interval must have elapsed before the time when the apostles were forced prematurely to quit the place. Their stay was prolonged to an extent of which Acts gives no idea; for Paul not only supported himself by working at his trade but had time to receive repeated gifts of money[1] from his friends at Philippi, a hundred miles away, as well as to engage perhaps in mission work throughout Macedonia (i. 7) if not as far west as Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19, *cf.* Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, 237 f.). Two or three months possibly may be allowed for this fruitful mission at Thessalonica.

When the local πολιτάρχαι, at the instigation of Jews who were nettled at the Christians' success, finally expelled Paul and his companions, the subsequent movements of the latter were governed by a desire to keep in touch with the inexperienced and unconsolidated Christian community which they had left behind them. The summary outline of Acts xvii. 10-15 requires to be supplemented and

[1] Probably this was one of the reasons which led to the imputation of mercenary motives (ii. 5, 9).

corrected at this point by the information of 1 Thess. ii. 17-iii. 6. According to Luke, Silas and Timotheus remained at Beroea, under orders to rejoin Paul as soon as possible. They only reached him at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5), however. Now since Timotheus, as we know from Paul, visited Thessalonica in the meantime, we must assume one of two courses. (*a*) Leaving Silas at Beroea, Timotheus hurried on to Paul at Athens, was sent back (with a letter ?) to Thessalonica, and, on his return, picked up Silas at Beroea ; whereupon both joined their leader, who by this time had moved on suddenly to Corinth. This implies that the plural in iii. 1 is the *pluralis majestaticus* or *auctoris* (see on iii. 5), since Silas was not with Paul at Athens. But the possibility of that plural meaning both Paul and Silas, together with the silence of Acts, suggests (*b*) an alternative reconstruction of the history, *viz.*, that Timotheus and Silas journeyed together from Beroea to Athens, where they met Paul and were despatched thence on separate missions, Silas[1] perhaps to Philippi, Timotheus at an earlier date to Thessalonica, both rejoining Paul eventually at Corinth. In any case the natural sense of iii. 1, 2 is that Paul sent Timotheus from Athens, not (so *e.g.*, von Soden, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1885, 291 f.) that he sent directions from Athens for his colleague to leave Beroea and betake himself to Thessalonica (*E. Bi.*, 5076, 5077).

From no church did Paul tear himself with such evident reluctance. His anxiety to get back to it was not simply due to the feeling that he must go on with the Macedonian mission, if at all possible, but to his deep affection for the local community. The Macedonian churches may almost be termed Paul's favourites. None troubled him less. None came so near to his heart. At Thessalonica the exemplary character of the Christians,[2] their rapid growth,

[1] This mission, or a mission of Silas (*cf.* iii. 5) after Timotheus to Thessalonica itself, though passed over both by Luke and Paul, must be assumed, if the statement of Acts xviii. 5 is held to be historical, since the latter passage implies that Paul was not accompanied by Silas from Athens to Corinth. The alternative is to suppose that he left Silas behind in Athens, as at Beroea. A comparison of 1 Thess. with Acts bears out the aphorism of Baronius that *epistolaris historia est optima historia ;* Luke's narrative is neither clear nor complete.

[2] Renan (*S. Paul*, 135-139) praises the solid, national qualities of the Macedonians, "un peuple de paysans protestants ; c'est une belle et forte race, laborieuse, sédentaire, aimant sons pays, pleine d'avenir". It was their very warmth of heart which made them at once so loyal to Paul and his gospel, and also so liable to unsettlement in view of their friends' death (iv. 15 f.). Compare the description of the Macedonian churches in von Dobschütz's *Christ. Life in the Primitive Church*, pp. 81 f.

their exceptional opportunities,[1] and their widespread reputation, moved him to a pardonable pride. But, as he learnt, they had been suffering persecution since he left, and this awakened sympathy as well as concern for its effects on their faith. Unable to return himself, he had at last sent Timotheus to them; it was the joyful tidings (iii. 6) just brought by him which prompted Paul to send off this informal letter, partly (i.) to reciprocate their warm affection, partly (ii.) to give them some fresh instructions upon their faith and conduct.

§ 2. *The First Epistle.*—This two-fold general object determines the course of the letter, which was written from Corinth[2] (Acts xviii. 11). It begins with a hearty thanksgiving for the success of the mission at Thessalonica (i. 2-10), and this naturally passes into an *apologia pro vita sua* (ii. 1-12) against the insinuations which he had heard that local outsiders were circulating vindictively against the character of the apostles. The Thessalonian church knew better than to believe such sordid calumnies! The second reason for thanksgiving is (ii. 13 f.) the church's brave endurance of hardship at the hands of their townsmen. "Would that we could be at your side! Would that we could uphold you and share the good fight! But we cannot. It is our misfortune, not our fault." Paul now gives a detailed *apologia pro absentia sua* (ii. 17 f.), which ends with praise for the staunchness of his friends during his enforced absence. The latter part of the letter (iv. 1 f.) consists of a series of shrewd, kindly injunctions for the maintenance of their position: περὶ ἁγιασμοῦ (iv. 3-8), περὶ φιλαδελφίας (9 f.) περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων (13-18), περὶ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν (v. 1-11). With a handful of precepts upon social and religious duties, and an earnest word of prayer, the epistle then closes. Its date depends on the view taken of Pauline chronology in general; that is, it may lie between 48 and

[1] "Nature has made it the capital and seaport of a rich and extensive district" (Finlay, *Byzantine Empire*, book ii., chap. i. 2). One of its great streets was part of the famous Via Egnatia, along which Paul and his companions had travelled S.W. from Philippi; thus Thessalonica was linked with the East and with the Adriatic alike (*cf.* i. 7, 8), while its position at the head of the Thermaic Gulf made it a busy trading centre for the Egean. Hence the colony of Jews with their synagogue. It was a populous, predominantly Greek town, of some military importance, with strong commercial interests throughout Macedonia (*cf.* i. 8) and even beyond. On the far horizon, south-west, the cloudy height of Mount Olympus was visible, no longer peopled by the gods, but, as Cicero put it, occupied merely by snow and ice (*cf.* i. 9).

[2] This is proved not by ἐν Ἀθήναις (iii. 1, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 32, xvi. 8) but by the reference to Achaia in 1 Thess. i. 7, 8.

53 A.D., probably nearer the latter date than the former. The epistle itself contains no reference to any year or contemporary event, which would afford a fixed point of time. An ingenious attempt has been made by Prof. Rendel Harris (*Exp.*[5] viii. 161 f., 401 f.; *cf.* B. W. Bacon's *Introd. to N.T.*, 73 f. and his *Story of St. Paul*, 235 f.) to show that Timotheus had previously taken a letter from Paul to the church, and that the canonical epistle represents a reply to one sent from the church to Paul; the hypothesis is tenable, but the evidence is rather elusive. The use of καὶ, *e.g.*, in ii. 13, iii. 5, is not to be pressed into a proof of this: οἴδατε is not an infallible token of such a communication (= "you have admitted in your letter," which Timotheus brought), and ἀπαγγέλλετε[1] is an unsupported conjecture in i. 9.

§ 3. *The Position of the Local Church.*—The occasion and the significance of this epistle to the Christians of Thessalonica thus become fairly clear.

(*a*) Paul and his friends had left them the memory and inspiration of a Christian character. The epistle came to be written because the legacy had been disputed.

The insinuations of some local Jews and pagans[2] against Paul's character were like torches flung at an unpopular figure; they simply served to light up his grandeur. Had it not been for such attacks, at Thessalonica as at Corinth, we should not have had these passages of indignant and pathetic self-revelation in which Paul opens his very heart and soul. But this is the compensation derived by a cool and later age. At the moment the attack was more than distasteful to Paul himself. He resented it keenly on account of his converts, for his enemies and theirs were trying to strike at these inexperienced Christians through him, not by questioning his apostolic credentials but by calumniating his motives during the mission and his reasons for not returning afterwards. To discredit him was to shake their faith. To stain his character was to upset their religious standing. The passion and persistence with which he finds it needful to repudiate such misconceptions, show that he felt them to be not simply

[1] The ordinary reading gives quite a good sense: ἃ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐχρῆν παρ' ἡμῶν ἀκούειν, ταῦτα αὐτοὶ προλαβόντες λέγουσι (Chrysostom). It is both arbitrary and fanciful of Zahn (*Einleitung*, § 13) to mould such allusions into a theory that the news had reached Asia, and that Paul was now in personal touch with envoys from the churches of Galatia, to whom he wrote Galatians before Silvanus and Timotheus rejoined him at Athens.

[2] It is unreal to confine the calumnies to the one or to the other, particularly to the pagans (so *e.g.*, von Soden, pp. 306 f.; Clemen, *Paulus*, ii. 181 f.).

a personal insult but likely to prove a serious menace to the interests of his friends at Thessalonica. The primary charge against the Christian evangelists had been treason or sedition; they were arraigned before the local authorities for setting up βασιλέα ἕτερον (Acts xvii. 6-8). But during his enforced absence (thanks to the success of this manœuvre), further charges against Paul's personal character were disseminated. He was just a sly, unscrupulous, selfish fellow! He left his dupes in the lurch! And so forth. Naturally, when he comes to write, it is the latter innuendoes which occupy his mind. The former charge is barely mentioned (ii. 12, *God's own kingdom*, *cf.* II., i. 5).

Paul's vindication of his character and conduct, which occupies most of the first part of the epistle, is psychologically apt. He was the first Christian the Thessalonians had ever seen. He and his friends practically represented the Christian faith. It had been the duty of the apostles to give not only instruction but a personal example of the new life to these converts; thus their reputation formed a real asset at Thessalonica. καὶ ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε καὶ τοῦ κυρίου.[1] If the local Christians were to lose faith in their leaders, then, with little or nothing to fall back upon, their faith in God might go (*cf.* iii. 5). It was this concern on their behalf[2] which led Paul to recall his stay among them and to go over his actions since then, with such anxious care (see notes on i. 4 f., ii. 1-11, 17 f., iii. 1-13).

(*b*) In addition to this, the Thessalonian community possessed definite παραδόσεις, in the shape of injunctions or regulations as to the faith and conduct of the Christian life (ii. 11, iv. 1, 12; *cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 5, 15, iii. 6). These were authoritative regulations,[3] as the other epistles indicate (*cf. e.g.*, 1 Cor. iv. 17) which had the sanc-

[1] On the ethical function of this self-assertion, as a means of inspiration and education, see *Exp. Ti.*, x. 445 f. The young Italian patriots who died, as they had lived, confessing their faith in "God, Mazzini, and Duty," are a modern case in point. The example of τοῦ κυρίου implies that the Thessalonians were familiar with the earthly trials and temptations of Jesus.

[2] The language of ii. 1-10 must not be taken as if Paul had been blaming himself for having appeared to leave his friends in the lurch. It is not the sensitiveness of an affectionate self-reproach but the indignant repudiation of local slanders which breathes through the passage. The former would be a sadly *post factum* defence.

[3] The epistle itself (*cf.* v. 27) takes its place in the series; this verse (see note) is perfectly intelligible as it stands and need not be suspected as the interpolation of a later reader to emphasise the apostolic authority of the epistle (so Schmiedel and others), much less taken (as *e.g.*, by Baur, van der Vies, 106 f., and Schräder, *der Apostel Paulus*, 36) to discredit the entire epistle. There is no hint of any clerical organisation such as the latter theory involves.

tion of apostolic tradition, and must have been based, in some cases, upon definite sayings of Jesus. It is the Christian halacha of which the later epistles give ample if incidental proof.

This suggests a further question. To what extent do the Thessalonian epistles reveal (*c*) an acquaintance on the part of Paul and the local church with the sayings of the Lord? The evidence cannot be estimated adequately except in the light of the corroborative facts drawn from an examination of the other epistles, but it is enough to bear the general consideration in mind, that no preoccupation with the risen Christ and his return could have rendered Paul absolutely indifferent to the historical data of the life of Jesus.[1] When he told the Thessalonians that Jesus was the Christ, they could not believe without knowing something of Jesus. The wrath of God they might have reason to fear. But ὁ ῥυόμενος? Who was He to exercise this wonderful function? Where had He lived? Why had He died? Had He risen? And when was He to return? Some historical content[2] had to be put into the name Jesus, if faith was to awaken, especially in people who lived far from Palestine. The Spirit did not work in a mental vacuum, or in a hazy mist of apocalyptic threats and hopes. Hence, *a priori*, it is natural to assume that such historical allusions to the life and teaching of Jesus may be reflected in Paul's letters, as they must have been present in his preaching. This expectation is justified.

The coincidence of ii. 7 and Luke xxii. 27 is not indeed sufficient to warrant any such inference, while the different meanings of καλεῖν in ii. 12 and in the parable of Luke xiv. 15 f. (*cf.* ver. 24) prevent any hypothesis of a connection. On the other hand ii. 14-16 certainly contains a reminiscence of the logia preserved in a passage like Luke xi. 48 f. = Matt. xxiii. 32-34 (see the full discussion in Resch's *Parallel Texte*, ii. 278 f., iii. 209 f.), and, while the thought of iii. 3*b*-4 (*cf.* i. 4-6) only resembles that of Luke ix. 22-24, just as iii. 13 may be derived from an O.T. background instead of, necessarily, from synoptic logia like those of Mark viii. 38 = Matt. xvi. 27, a sentence such as that in iv. 8 distinctly echoes the saying in Luke x. 16 ("l'allusion

[1] This idea dominates von Soden's brilliant essay in *Theol. Abhandlungen C. von Weizsäcker gewidmet* (1892), pp. 113-167. More balanced estimates are to be found in Keim's *Jesus of Nazara*, i., pp. 54 f.; Titius, *der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit* (1900), pp. 10-18, and M. Goguel, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus Christus* (1904), pp. 67-99. The English reader may consult Sabatier's *Paul*, pp. 76 f., and Dr. R. J. Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles* (1892) where, as in his *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ* (1905), the shallows as well as the depths of the relevant literature are indefatigably dredged.

[2] *Cf.* Prof. Denney in *DCG*, ii. 394 f.

est d'une netteté parfaite," M. Goguel, p. 87). The well-known λόγος Κυρίου of iv. 16 f. cannot be adduced in this connection without hesitation (see note). But no possible doubt attaches to the evidence of v. 1-3. The saying of Jesus which is echoed here has been preserved in Luke xii. 39 (ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται)[1] and xxi. 34 (μή ποτε . . . ἐπιστῇ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ὡς παγίς), but the common original seems to have been in Aramaic or Hebrew (so Prof. Marshall, *Exp.*[4] ii. 73 f.), since Paul's ὥσπερ ἡ ὠδίν and Luke's ὡς παγίς must reflect a phrase like חבל(ב), which might be rendered either as חֶבֶל (snare) or as חֵבֶל (travail), the latter echoing the well-known conception of ἀρχὴ ὠδινῶν (*cf.* Mark xiii. 8). A further echo of the primitive evangelic tradition is to be heard possibly in v. 6 (Matt. xxiv. 42), certainly in v. 13 (*cf.* Mark ix. 50). But the connection of v. 21 with the agraphon, γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται, is curious rather than vital.

In the second epistle, apart from coincidences like i. 5 (= Luke xx. 35) and iii. 3 (= Matt. vi. 13), the allusions to the teaching of Jesus are less numerous, although Resch hears the echo of a logion in iii. 10 (*Paulinismus*, 409 f.), on most inadequate grounds. The apocalyptic passage, ii. 1-10, contains several striking parallels to the language of Matt. xxiv. (*cf.* H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, 55 f., 96 f.), but no literary relationship can be assumed.

(*d*) Finally, before Paul left, he arranged for a kind of informal organisation. An ordination of πρεσβύτεροι is not to be thought of, but probably the earliest converts, or at any rate those who had natural gifts, assumed an unofficial superintendence of the community, arranged for its worship and internal management, and were careful that the sick and poor and young were looked after. Otherwise, the movement might have been dissipated. Wesley, in his journal (Aug., 1763), writes: "I was more convinced than ever that the preaching like an apostle, without joining together those that are awakened, and training them up in the ways of God, is only begetting children for the murderer. How much preaching has there been for these twenty years all over Pembrokeshire! but no regular societies, no discipline, no order or connection; and the consequence is, that nine in ten of the once-awakened are now faster asleep than ever." Paul was alive to the same need. He was a practical missionary,

[1] With Luke's πίνειν καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι (45) and μέθῃ (xxi. 34) compare the οἱ μεθυσκόμενοι of 1 Thess. v. 7. Contrast also the ἐκφυγεῖν of xxi. 36 with Paul's οὐ μὴ ἐκφύγωσιν (v. 3). The phrase *sons of light* may well have been common among the early Christians (*cf.* Abbott's *Johannine Vocabulary*, 1782-1783).

and, as these epistles show (*cf.* I., v. 12 f., II., iii. 6 f.), he knew better than to leave his young societies with nothing more than the vague memory of pious preaching. The local organisation was, as yet, primitive, but evidently it was sufficient to maintain itself and carry on the business of the church, when the guiding hand of the missionary was removed (*cf.* Clem. Rom. xlii.), though the authority of the leaders still required upon occasion the support and endorsement of the apostles (see on v. 12).

§ 4. *The Character and Setting of the Second Epistle.*—In the second and shorter epistle, after congratulating the local Christians especially on their patient faith (i. 1-4), Paul explains that the trials and troubles which called this virtue into exercise were but the prelude to a final relief and vindication at the ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (4-12). As the ardent expectation of this had, however, produced a morbid excitement in some quarters, he sets himself (ii. 1-12) to weed out such mistakes and mischiefs by reminding the church of his previous warning that the end could not come until the μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας attained its climax in a supernatural and personal embodiment of evil, which would vainly challenge the authority and provoke the interposition of the Lord. He then concludes (ii. 13-17) with an expression of confidence in them, an appeal for loyalty to his teaching, and a brief prayer on their behalf. Asking their prayers, in return, for himself, he renews his expression of confidence and interest (iii. 1-5); whereupon, with a word upon the maintenance of discipline and industry, the epistle ends (iii. 6-18).

Assuming both epistles to have come from Paul,[1] we may unhesitatingly place 2 Thess. after 1 Thess. The evidence for the opposite order, advocated by Grotius in his *Annotationes* (ii. 715 f., based on an antiquated chronology), Ewald (*Jahrb. für bibl. Wiss.* 1861, 249 f., *Sendschreiben des Paulus*, 19 f.), Laurent (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1864, pp. 497 f., *N.T. Studien*, 49 f.), and J. S. Chamberlain (*The Epp. of Paul the Apostle*, 1907, 5 f.), breaks down upon examination. It is unnatural to find a reference to II. iii. 6-16 in I. iv. 10-11; besides, as Bornemann points out (p. 495), if 2 Thess. is held to betray all the characteristics of a first letter (Ewald), what about II. ii. 15? There is no reason why such a criterion of genuineness

[1] On the hypothesis that both are post-Pauline, Baur (*Paulus*, Eng. tr., ii. 336 f., and van der Vies (*de beiden brieven aan de Th.*, 1865, pp. 128-164) argue for the priority of 2 Thess., the latter separating the two by the fall of Jerusalem; van Manen (*Onderzoek naar de Echtheid van P. tweeden Brief an die Thess.*, 1865, pp. 11-25) refutes both critics. The arguments for the canonical order are best stated by von Hofmann (365), Lünemann (160 f.), and Bornemann (492 f.) in their editions.

as that of II. iii. 17, should have occurred in the earliest of Paul's letters; in view of ii. 3, its appearance, after the composition of 1 Thess. and even of other letters, is psychologically valid. The comparative absence of allusions in 2 Thess. to 1 Thess. (*cf.* however, II. ii. 1 = I. iv. 17, etc.) is best explained by the fact that in the second letter Paul is going back to elaborate part of his original oral teaching in the light of fresh needs which had emerged since he wrote the first epistle. In this sense, and in this sense only, 2 Thess. anticipates the other letter. Finally, while I. ii. 17-iii. 6 does not absolutely exclude the possibility of a previous letter, it cannot be taken to presuppose one of the character of 2 Thess., least of all when the letter is dated from Beroea (Acts xvii. 10, Ewald and Laurent).

§ 5. *Its Authenticity.*—Since Paul Schmidt's edition (see below) and von Soden's essay (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1885, pp. 263-310), with which the English reader may compare Jowett's proof (vol. i., pp. 4-17), it is no longer necessary to discuss the authenticity of the first epistle, or even its integrity. Almost the only passage where a marginal gloss may be reasonably conjectured to have crept into the text is ii. 16.[1] The second epistle, however, starts a real problem, both on the score of its resemblance to the first epistle and of its divergence from the style and thought of that or indeed of any other Pauline letter. Paul is still with Silvanus and Timotheus (i. 1) at Corinth (iii. 2, reff.; 1 Thess. ii. 15 f.), writing presumably not long after the despatch of the former epistle (ii. 15). Fresh information has reached him (iii. 11),[2] and his aim is to repudiate further misconceptions of his teaching upon the Last Things, as well as to steady the church amid its more recent anabaptist perils. Hence he writes in substantially the same tone and along the same lines as before; anything he has to communicate is practically a restatement of what he had already taught orally (ii. 5, 15), not a discussion of novel doubts and principles. If any change has taken place in the local situation, it has been in the

[1] The *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the epistle, if it is genuine, is his next visit to Thessalonica (Acts xx. 1, 2); most probably it was despatched before Acts xviii. 12. Corinth is the only place where we know the three men were together at this period.

[2] How, we are not told. Possibly Paul had been asked by the local leaders to exert his influence and authority against pietistic developments in the community (iii. 14). The situation demanded an explicit written message; probably no visit of Silvanus or Timotheus would have sufficed, even had they been able to leave Corinth. Spitta's theory (see below) implies that Timotheus had been in Thessalonica since 1 Thess. was written (ἔτι, ii. 5), but of this there is no evidence whatever.

direction of shifting the centre of gravity from fears about the dead to extravagant ideas entertained by the living. Hence, for one thing, the general similarity of structure and atmosphere in both epistles, and, upon the other hand, the sharper emphasis in the second upon Paul's authority.

Both features have raised widespread suspicion and elicited a variety of reconstructions of the epistle's date and object (*cf. Historical New Testament*, 142-146). The common ground of all such theories is the postulate that 2 Thess. is the work of a later Paulinist, during the age of Nero or of Trajan, who has employed 1 Thess. in order to produce a restatement of early Christian eschatology, under the aegis of the apostle, or to claim Paul's sanction for an onslaught upon Gnostic views. This is a fair hypothesis, which at first sight seems to account adequately for several of the variations and resemblances between the two writings. When it is worked out in detail, however, it becomes rather less convincing. Some chastening facts emerge. Why, *e.g.*, should such a writer fix on 1 Thess., and laboriously work on it? Then (i.) one serious preliminary obstacle is that while pseudonymous epistles addressed ostensibly to individuals (*e.g.*, the pastorals) or to Christendom in general (*e.g.*, 2 Peter) are intelligible enough, the issue of such an epistle, addressed to a definite church which had already a genuine letter of the apostle, involves very serious difficulties. These are not eased by the light-hearted explanation (so Schmiedel and Wrede[1]) that the epistle was really meant not for Thessalonica at all, but for some other community! This is to buttress one hypothesis by another. Furthermore (ii.) the style and vocabulary offer no decisive proof of a post-Pauline origin. *Of* the ἅπαξ εἰρημένα, which are comparatively few, one or two, like ἀποστασία (ii. 3), δίκη (=punishment, i. 9, *cf.* Sap. xviii. 11, etc. Jude 7), ἐνδοξάζομαι (i. 10, 12), ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι (i. 4 Pss.), τίνω (i. 9), περιεργάζομαι (iii. 2, *cf.* Sir. iii. 23), σέβασμα (ii. 4, *cf.* Sap. xiv. 20), and σημειοῦσθαι (iii. 14), may be fairly ascribed to the influence of the LXX[2] upon

[1] In pp. 38 f. of his able pamphlet on *Die Echtheit des zweiten Th.* (1903). Wredé knocks on the head (pp. 96 f.) the earlier theories (best represented by Schmiedel) which dated the epistle in the seventh decade of the first century, but he does not succeed better than Holtzmann or Hollmann in presenting any very satisfactory theory of its origin *c.* 100 A.D. His essay is carefully reviewed by Wernle (*Gött. Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1905, 347 f.), who adheres to the Pauline authorship, as does Clemen (*Paulus*, i., pp. 115-122). Klöpper's article in defence of the epistle against the older attacks (*Theol. Studien u. Skizzen aus Ostpreussen*, 1889, viii., pp. 73-140) is almost as difficult to read as it is to refute.

[2] The absence of any explicit quotation from the LXX only throws into relief the extent to which, especially in i. 5 f., O.T. language and ideas have been woven into the tissue of the epistle (Acts xvii. 2, 3, ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν).

the writer's mind. Similarly with εἴλατο (ii. 13) and ἰσχύς (i. 9). The occurrence of ἐπιφάνεια (ii. 8), elsewhere only in the pastorals, is certainly striking, and were there more of these words, the case for a later date would be reinforced. But there are not. Besides, the construction of ἐπιφ. here is different from those which occur in the pastorals, and the latter are as likely to have copied 2 Thess. as *vice-versa*, if any literary relationship has to be assumed. The vocabulary thus, as is generally recognised, permits of no more than a *non liquet* verdict. The style, upon the whole, has quite a Pauline ring about it; and, while this may be due to imitation, it would be uncritical to assume this result without examining (iii.) the internal relation of the two epistles. It is on this aspect of the problem that recent critics are content to rest their case (so *e.g.*, Wrede, 3-36, H. J. Holtzmann, in *Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1901, 97-108, and Hollmann, *ibid.*, 1904, 28-38). The so-called (*a*) discrepancies need not detain us long. The different reasons given by Paul for having supported himself (*cf.* on I. ii. 9; II. iii. 7) are not contradictory but correlative; both are psychologically credible, as expressions of a single experience. Greater difficulty attaches to the apparent change of front towards the second advent. In I. v. 2, the advent is unexpected and sudden;[1] in II. ii. 3 f., it is the climax of a development. But this discrepancy, such as it is (*cf.* on I. v. 3), attaches to almost all the early Christian views of the end; to be instantaneous and to be heralded by a historical prelude were traits of the End which were left side by side not only by Jesus (*cf.* Matt. xxiv. 3 f., 23 f., 32 f.)[2] but by later prophets (*cf.* Rev. iii. 3 = vi. 1 f.). In any case, Paul was more concerned about the practical religious needs of his readers than about any strict or verbal consistency in a region of thought where Christian expectation, like the Jewish tradition to which it generally went back, was as yet far from being homogeneous or definite. The inconsistencies of the two Thessalonian epistles are at least as capable of explanation when they are taken to be variations of one man's mind at slightly different periods as when they are

[1] Not simply for unbelievers, but for Christians. It is hardly fair to explain the difference between the two epistles by confining the suddenness of the advent to the former. Hollmann is right in maintaining this against Jülicher and others, but the pseudonymity of 2 Thess. is by no means a necessary inference from it (see note on v. 3).

[2] This argument is not affected by the recognition of a small synoptic apocalypse in this chapter; even so, the primitive and genuine tradition of the words of Jesus on the end presents the same combination as the Thessalonian letters show. On the general attitude of Paul to the political and retributory elements in the current or traditional apocalyptic, *cf.* Titius, *der Paulinisimus* (1900), pp. 47 f.

held to denote the revision and correction of Paul's ideas by a later writer who had to reconcile the apparent postponement of the Advent with the primitive hope. This Baur himself is forward to admit (*Paulus*, Eng. Tr., ii. 93). "It is perfectly conceivable that one and the same writer, if he lived so much in the thought of the παρουσία as the two epistles testify, should have looked at this mysterious subject in different circumstances and from different points of view, and so expressed himself regarding it in different ways." This verdict really gives the case away. Such variations are hardly conceivable if both epistles emanated from a later writer, but they are intelligible, if Paul, living in the first flush and rush of the early Christian hope is held to be responsible for them. (*b*) The numerous and detailed similarities between the two epistles might be explained by the hypothesis that Paul read over a copy of 1 Thess. before writing 2 Thess., or that his mind was working still along the lines of thought voiced in the former epistle, when he came to write the latter. The first hypothesis is not to be dismissed lightly. The second can be illustrated from any correspondence. It is true that apart from ii. 1-12 the fresh material of 2 Thess. consists mainly in i. 5-12, ii. 15, iii. 2, 13, 14 f., and that there is throughout the letter a certain poverty of expression, a comparative absence of originality, a stiffness in parts, and a stereotyped adherence to certain forms.[1] But in the treatment of a subject like this it was inevitable that some phrases of self-repetition should recur, *e.g.*, the θλῖψις-group (i. 4-6), the πίστις-group (i. 4, 10, 11, ii. 11-13, iii. 2, 3), ἐργάζεσθαι, etc. Parts of the letter are unlike Paul. That is practically all we can say. But parts are fairly characteristic of him, and these not only outweigh the others, but dovetail into the corresponding data of 1 Thess. Such incidental agreements are too natural and too numerous to be the artificial mosaic of a later writer.

The internal evidence of ii. 3-12 is no longer adduced as a crucial proof of the un-Pauline origin of 2 Thess. Indeed most recent critics have given up this argument as primary. Fresh investigations into the origins of gnosticism and of the semi-political variations in primitive eschatology have undermined the older hypothesis which relegated this prophecy to the latter part of the first or the opening part of the second century, and it is only necessary to determine which of the possible reconstructions is most suitable to the age of Paul himself. On the whole, no solution of the apocalyptic prophecy

[1] The severer tone (iii. 6-15), as well as the more official tinge, of the letter were as necessary now for the Thessalonians as they were soon to be for the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 21, v. 3-5).

in ii. 3 f. fits in with the data so well as the early theory that ὁ κατέχων and τὸ κατέχον denote, not the episcopate as a restraint against gnosticism (Hilgenfeld and others), but the Emperor and imperial power of Rome ("quis nisi Romanus status?" Tertullian, *de Resurr.*, xxiv.). Paul had ample experience of the protection afforded by the polity of the empire against the malevolence of the Jews, and he apparently anticipated that this would continue for a time, until the empire fell. But how could the fall of the empire be expected? The answer lies not so much in any contemporary feelings of panic and dismay, as in the eschatological tradition, derived from a study of Daniel, which was evidently becoming current in certain Jewish and early Christian circles, that the empire represented the penultimate stage in the world's history. "And when Rome falls, the world." Hence the tone of reserve and cryptic ambiguity with which Paul speaks of its collapse, "ne calumniam incurreret, quod Romano imperio male optauerit, cum speraretur aeternum" (Aug., *Civ. Dei.*, xx.; so Jerome on 2 Thess. ii. 6). The idea of Rome's downfall could not be spoken of, or at least written about, openly. All that a Christian prophet could do was to hint that this future Deceiver or pseudo-Messiah would prove too strong even for the Restraining Empire, and that King Jesus would ultimately intervene to meet and to defeat him. An entire change came over the spirit of the dream, when, nearly half a century later the imperial cultus in Asia Minor stirred the prophet John to denounce Rome as the supreme antagonist of God. The empire, on this view, was no providential restraint on τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας, but was herself μυστήριον (Rev. xvii. 5), loathsome and dangerous and doomed. This altered prospect lay far beyond the horizon of Paul. The imperial worship had not yet become formidable, and to him the empire, with its administrative justice, stood for a welcome, even though a temporary, barrier against the antagonistic forces of Judaism. The kingdom of God was not the opponent of the empire, but simply the final conqueror of a foe who would prove too strong even for the restraining control of Roman civilisation.

This interpretation of the restraining power[1] implies that the supernatural antagonist issues from Judaism (so especially Weiss, *N.T. Theologie*, § 63). Here again patristric tradition seems to cor-

[1] *Cf.* Neumann's *Hippolytus von Rom* (Leipzig, 1902), pp. 4 f. The κατέχων is not to be associated with any special emperor, not even with Claudius, whose name has a curious resemblance to it. The theories which identify the Restrainer with Vespasian (as a check on Nero Redivivus), Antichrist, or Domitian, depend on *a priori* conceptions of the epistle's origin and aim.

roborate it. Both Irenæus (*adv. Haer.*, v. 25, i. 30, 2) and Hippolytus (*de Antichristo*, vi., xiv.) expressly state that antichrist is to be of Jewish descent, and the later echoes of the tradition are as pronounced (*cf.* Bousset's *Antichrist*, pp. 24 f., 127 f., 182 f.; *E. Bi.*, 179 f.).[1] Antichrist is to set up his kingdom in Judah; his reign is from Jerusalem, and the Jews are the dupes of his miraculous influence.[2] The ἀποστασία, which Paul anticipates, implies a relationship to God which could not be postulated of Christians, much less of pagans in general who, *ex hypothesis*, "knew not God" (i. 8). The only deliberate anti-Christian movement, which Paul and his friends had already experienced (ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται), was Jewish fanaticism; its professed zeal for the Law was really ἀνομία, as the apostle puts it with a touch of scathing irony.

Paul is plainly operating with a Beliar(l)-saga[3] in this passage. If one could only be certain that Sibyll. iii. 63-73 represented a pre-Christian Jewish fragment, as its context indicates, or that any Christian interpolations were confined to minor phrases like ἐκ δὲ Σεβαστηνῶν, we should have one clear trace of this saga. Belial there works many signs (as in Sibyll. ii. 37, καὶ βελίαρ θ' ἥξει καὶ σήματα πολλὰ ποιήσει ἀνθρώποις), seduces many even of elect believers within Judaism (πολλοὺς πλανήσει, πιστούς τ' ἐκλεκτούς θ' Ἑβραίους, ἀνόμους τε καὶ ἄλλους ἀνέρας, οἵτινες οὔπω Θεοῦ λόγον εἰσήκουσαν), and is finally burned up, together with his adherents. The suspicions of this passage's Jewish character seem unjustified; it may be taken, without much hesitation, as one reflection of the tradition which was in

[1] Bousset often exaggerates the independence of patristic eschatological tradition; he fails to allow enough for the luxuriant fancies of a later age, which applied the N.T. text arbitrarily to contemporary life. But on this point the evidence is fairly decisive, *viz.*, that the early fathers were not merely building on the text of 2 Thess. ii. 3-6, when they spoke of Antichrist being a seducer whose false worship was set up within a reconstructed temple at Jerusalem.

[2] Professor Warfield (*Expos.*[3] iv. 40 f.) regards the Jewish state as the divine restraint upon the revelation of Rome's self-deification. This view is more sensible than that of the Restrainer as Christianity or the church (*cf.* Reimpell, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1887, 711-736), but it is difficult to see how Judaism could be said to impose any check upon the imperial cultus; besides, is it likely that Paul would have subtly combined a polemic against the obstinate antagonism of the Jews with a theory of their unconscious protective services to the church?

[3] See R. H. Charles' edition of *Ascensio Isaiae* (pp. lxii.-lxiii.) and M. Friedländer's *Religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu* (1905, pp. 50 f.). This would be corroborated if Beliar were shown to be, as the latter writer argues (in his *Der Antichrist*, 1901), a pre-Christian embodiment of the Jewish antinomian sect מינים. For a possible source of such traditions in Paul's case *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 8.

Paul's mind when he wrote 2 Thess. ii. 2 f. Belial is not indeed named here, as he is in 2 Cor. vi. 15. But he is the opponent of Jesus the true messiah. He appears in human form (*cf. Asc. Isa.*, iv. 2: "Beliar the great ruler, the king of this world will descend . . . in the likeness of a man, a lawless king") as the arch-emissary or agent of Satan. The latter, whom Paul here as elsewhere (in consonance with Jewish tradition) keeps in the background, is the supreme opponent of God; but as God's representative is the Lord Jesus Christ, so Satan's active representative is this mysterious figure, whose methods are a caricature of the true messiah's (see notes below on the passage). This is borne out by the contemporary sense of Βελίαλ as ἄγγελος τῆς ἀνομίας (*Asc. Isa.*, ii. 4, etc.) or ἀνομία (ἀποστασία) in LXX. The man of lawlessness, whom Paul predicts, is thus one of whom Belial is a prototype. Only, the apostle fuses this παράνομος with the false messiah, originally a different figure, who is represented as the incarnation of Satan, the devil in human embodiment. That he expected this mysterious opponent to rise within Judaism is not surprising under the circumstances. He was in no mood, at this moment of tension, to think hopefully of the Jews. They were a perpetual obstacle and annoyance to him, ἄτοποι καὶ πονηροὶ. He had already denounced them as θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων (I., ii. 15), and from this it was but a step to the position, suggested by the tradition perhaps, that their repudiation of God's final revelation in Jesus would culminate in an ἀποστασία, which welcomed the last rival of Jesus as God's messiah. His prophecy thus embodies a retort.[1] "You Jews hate and persecute us as apostates from God; you denounce our Jesus as a false messiah. But the

[1] In Dan. viii. 23 f. when the cup of Israel's guilt is full (πληρουμένων τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν), the climax of their punishment came in the person of Antiochus Epiphanes, the presumptuous (ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ὑψωθήσεται, *cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 4) and astute (τὸ ψεῦδος ἐν χερσὶν αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ δόλῳ ἀφανιεῖ πολλούς, *cf.* 2 Thess. i. 9, 11). Paul, like the rest of the early Christians, still looked for some immediate fulfilment of this prophecy. In the contemporary malevolence of the Jews towards the gospel he saw a sign of its realisation, as the allusion in 1 Thess. ii. 16 (εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας) indicates. The penal consequence of this attitude must have also formed part of his oral teaching at Thessalonica, but he does not mention it till local circumstances drew from him a reminder of the final Deluder who must soon come (2 Thess. ii. 3 f.). It is important to notice this underlying tradition, or application of tradition, in the apostle's mind, on account of its bearing upon the general harmony of the eschatology in the two epistles. Furthermore, since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, the book of Daniel had made self-deification a note of the final enemy. Any vivid expectation of the End, such as that cherished by a Jewish Christian of Paul's temperament, instinctively seized upon this trait of the false messiah.

false messiah will come from you, and his career will be short-lived at the hands of our Christ." To the Christian the prophecy brought an assurance that, while the coldest and darkest hour must precede the dawn, the dawn was sure to come, and to come soon. Thus in both epistles, but particularly in the second, the reader can see the torch of apocalyptic enthusiasm, streaming out with smoke as well as with red flame, which many early Christians employed to light up their path amid the dark providences of the age. Paul is prophesying—none the less vividly that he does so ἐκ μέρους.

Attempts have also been made, from various sides, to solve the literary problem of the writing by finding in it (*a*) either a Pauline nucleus which has been worked over, (*b*) or a Pauline letter which has either suffered interpolation or (*c*) incorporated some earlier apocalyptic fragment, possibly of Jewish origin. (*a*) According to Paul Schmidt (*Der erste Thess. nebst einem Excurs über den zweiten gleichn. Brief*, 1885, pp. 111 f.), a Paulinist in 69 A.D. edited and expanded a genuine letter = i. 1-4, ii. 1-2*a*, ii. 13-iii. 18. But, apart from other reasons, the passages assigned to Paul are not free from the very feature which Schmidt considers fatal to the others, *viz.*, similarity to 1 Thess. And the similarities between ii. 3-12 and the apocalypse of John are very slight. The activity assigned to the editor is too restricted; besides, ii. 3-12 is so cardinal a feature of the epistle, that the latter stands or falls with it—so much so that it would be easier, with Hausrath, to view the whole writing as a scaffolding which rose round the original Pauline nucleus of ii. 1-12. Finally, the literary criteria do not bear out the distinction postulated by both theories. (*b*) The strongly retributive cast, the liturgical swing, and the O.T. colouring, of i. 6-10 have suggested the possibility of interpolation in this passage (McGiffert, *E. Bi.*, 5054, Findlay, p. lvii.), either as a whole or in part. This is at any rate more credible than the older idea that ii. 1-12 embodies a Montanist interpolation (J. E. C. Schmidt, *Bibliothek für Kritik u. Exegese der N.T.*, 1801, 385 f.) or ii. 1-9 a piece of Jewish Christian apocalyptic (Michelsen, *Theol., Tijdschrift*, 1876, 213 f.). Finally (*c*) the large amount of common ground between the Jewish and the primitive Christian conceptions of eschatology is enough (see on ii. 5) to invalidate Spitta's lonely theory (*Offenbarung des Joh.*, 497 f., and *Zur Gesch. und Litt. des Urchristentums*, i. 139 f.) of a Caligula-apocalypse, due in part to Timotheus,[1] in ii. 2-12, or the idea of Pierson

[1] *Cf.* Prof. G. G. Findlay's refutation in *Expos.*[6] ii. 255 f., and Bornemann's paragraphs (pp. 492, 529 f.).

and Naber (*Verisimilia*, 1886, 21 f.) that a pre-Christian apocalypse (i. 5-10, ii. 1-12, iii. 1-6, 14, 15) has been worked up by the unknown Paul of the second century whom the Holland critics find so prolific and indispensable.

The second epistle is inferior, in depth and reach, to the first, whatever view be taken of its origin, but both are especially valuable as indications of the personal tie between Paul and his churches, and as samples of the new literary form which the religious needs of early Christianity created in the epistle. Dryden has hit this off in his well-known lines upon the apostles and their communities :—

> As charity grew cold or faction hot,
> Or long neglect their lessons had forgot,
> For all their wants they wisely did provide,
> And preaching by epistles was supplied.
> So great physicians cannot all attend,
> But some they visit and to some they send.
> Yet all those letters were not sent to all,
> Nor first intended, but occasional—
> Their absent sermons.

The Thessalonian epistles were written to supply the lack of further personal intercourse and to supplement instruction already given. They were not treatises designed to convey the original teaching of the apostles ; they imply that, and they apply it along special lines, but they are not protocols of doctrine (*cf.* note on 1 Thess. iv. 4). At the same time, "occasional" must not be taken to mean casual or off-hand. Paul dictated with some care. His ideas are not impromptu notions, nor are they thrown out off-hand ; they represent a prolonged period of thought and of experience. Even these, the least formal of his letters, though written for the moment's need, reflect a background of wide range and fairly matured beliefs. Nevertheless, they are hardly "absent sermons". "Letters mingle souls," as Donne remarked, and 1 Thessalonians in particular is the unpremeditated outpouring of a strong man's tender, firm, and wise affection for people whom he bore upon his very heart. It is the earliest of Paul's extant letters, and it delivers the simpler truths of the Christian faith to us with all the dew and the bloom of a personal experience which not only enjoined them but lived to impart them. Both epistles show, as Jowett puts it, how Paul was "ever feeling, if haply he may find them, after the hearts of men". "He is not a bishop administering a regular system, but a person dealing with other persons out of the fulness of his own mind and nature. . . . If they live, he lives ; time and distance never snap the cord of

sympathy. His government of them is a sort of communion with them; a receiving of their feelings and a pouring forth of his own."

§ 6. *External Evidence, Text, and Literature of both Epistles.*— As both epistles are included not only in the Muratorian canon but in Marcion's strictly Pauline collection (Tert. *adv. Marc.* v. 15; Epiph., *Haer.* xlii. 9), they must have been known and circulated by the first quarter of the second century, although quotations (mainly of the eschatological sections) do not emerge till Irenæus and Tertullian. Both Clement of Alexandria and Origen used them, and other evidence of their existence will be found in any text book of the N.T. Canon. But the so-called allusions to 1 Thess. in the earlier apostolic fathers are, for the most part, scanty and vague; *e.g.*, of i. 5 and iv. 2 in Clem., Rom. xlii. 3. Hermas, *Vis.* iii. 9, 10 (εἰρηνεύετε ἐν αὐτοῖς) might go back to Mark as easily as to Paul (*cf.* on v. 13), though there is a similarity of context, while the general correspondence of outline between iv. 14-16 and Did. xvi. 6 (revelation of the Lord, trumpet, resurrection) may imply no more than a common use of tradition, if not of Matt. xxiv. The use of the epistle in the correspondence of Ignatius is probable, but far from certain; *e.g.*, i. 6 in Eph. x. 3 (μιμηταὶ δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου σπουδάζωμεν εἶναι, different context); ii. 4 in Rom. ii. 1 (οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀνθρωπαρεσκῆσαι, ἀλλὰ Θεῷ), and v. 17 in Eph. x. 1 (ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε, *si vera lectio*). There is but one parallel in Barnabas, iv. 9 = Barn. xxi. 6 (γένεσθε δὲ θεοδίδακτοι, different context). This scarcity of allusions is not surprising. The comparative lack of doctrinal interest in the first epistle, and its personal, intimate contents, would prevent it from being so often read and cited as the other Pauline letters. The second epistle, however, was evidently known to Justin Martyr (*Dial.* xxxii., cx., cxvi.) as well as to Polycarp who not only alludes to iii. 15 (in xi. 4, "et non sicut inimicos tales existimetis") but misquotes i. 4 (in quibus laborauit beatus Paulus, qui estis in principio epistulae eius, de uobis enim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis) as if it were addressed to the Philippians (*cf.* Wrede, 92 f.); and such data prove the circulation of 1 Thess. as well. The echoes of 2 Thess. in Barnabas (2 Thess. ii. 6 = Barn. xviii. 2; ii. 8, 12 = xv. 5) indicate rather more than a common basis of oral tradition (so Rauch in *Zeitschrift für die Wissensch. Theologie*, 1895, 458 f.), and, like the apocalypse of John, it appears to have been circulated in Gaul before the end of the second century (*cf.* letter from churches of Lyons and Vienne, Eus. *H. E.*, v. 1).

The text printed in this edition agrees generally with that of most critical editors. To save space, all textual notes have been cut out,

except where a variant reading bears directly on the exposition, or possesses some independent interest. Since Alford published his edition, the chief foreign commentaries have been those of von Hofmann (1869), Reuss (1878-9), Lünemann (Eng. tr., 1880) and Bornemann (1894) in Meyer's series, Schäfer (1890), Zöckler (1894), Zimmer's *Theologischer Commentar* (1891), Schmiedel (*Hand Commentar*, second edition, 1892, incisive and thorough), S. Goebel (second edition, 1897), B. Weiss (second edition, 1902), Wohlenberg (in Zahn's *Kommentar*, 1903; sec. ed. 1908), and Lueken (in *Die Schriften des N.T.*, 1905); in English, those of Eadie (1877), Alexander (*Speaker's Comm.*, 1881), Dr. Marcus Dods (*Schaff's Comm.*, iii., 1882), Dr. John Hutchinson (1884), Dr. J. Drummond (*Internat. Hdbk. to N.T.*, ii., 1899), and Dr. Adeney (*Century Bible*, n. d.), with three recent and able editions of the Greek text by Lightfoot (*Notes on Epp. of St. Paul*, 1895, pp. 1-92), Prof. G. G. Findlay (*Cambridge Greek Testament*, 1904), and Dr. G. Milligan (1908). Of the older works, the editions of L. Pelt (1830), H. O. Schott (1834), and A. Koch (on the first epistle, second edition, Berlin, 1855), in German, together with those of Ellicott (fourth edition, 1880) and Jowett (third edition, 1894), deserve special notice. Dr. Denney's terse exposition (*Expositor's Bible*, 1892), Lightfoot's essay (*Biblical Essays*, 251-269), and E. H. Askwith's *Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles* (1902), together with the articles of Lock (Hastings' *D.B.*, iv. 743-749) and A. C. McGiffert (*E. Bi.*, 5036-5046), and Dr. W. Gunion Rutherford's translation (1908), will furnish the English student with all necessary material for a general study of the epistles. Zimmer's monograph (*Der Text der Thess. Briefe*, 1893) and article on 2 Thess. (*Zeits. f. wiss. Theol.*, xxxi. 322-342) give a competent survey of the textual data.

The abbreviations are for the most part familiar and obvious; *e.g.*, Blass = *Neutest. Grammatik*, Burton = *Moods and Tenses* (1894), Deissmann = D.'s *Bible Studies* (Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1901), DCG = Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (1907-1908), *E. Bi.* = *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Field = *Otium Norvicense*, part iii. (1899), Moulton = J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, vol. i. (1906), Viteau = Viteau's *Étude sur le grec du N.T.* (1893, 1896), Win. = Schmiedel's edition of G. B. Winer's *Grammatik* (Göttingen, 1894 f.). With regard to the references to Sap. (*i.e.*, The Wisdom of Solomon), it must be remembered that Paul in all likelihood knew this writing at first hand.

ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Ā.

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ καὶ [a] Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλο- [a] *Cf.* on 2 Cor. i. 19.
νικέων ἐν [b] Θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ· [c] χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ [b] On absence of article, see Blass, §§ 46. 6, 47. 10.
εἰρήνη.

2. [d] Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ [e] πάντοτε περὶ [e] πάντων ὑμῶν, [f] μνείαν [c] See on 1 Cor. i. 3 and Eph. i. 2.
ποιούμενοι [f] ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν 3. [g] ἀδιαλείπτως, μνημονεύ-

d So Col. i. 3. e Eph. v. 20. f Eph. i. 16. g v. 17; Rom. i. 9

Chapter I.—Ver. 1. *Greeting.*—As any trouble at Thessalonica had arisen over Paul's character more than his authority, or rather as his authority had been struck through his character, he does not introduce his own apostolic rank or that of his colleagues (ii. 6) in the forefront of this letter, which is intimate and unofficial throughout. Silvanus is put before Timothy as an older man and colleague, and also as Paul's special coadjutor in the local mission. Acts never mentions Timothy in the Macedonian mission till xvii. 14, where he appears beside Silvanus. This does not mean (Bleek) that Timothy took no part in the work at Thessalonica; his intimate relations with the church forbid this supposition. Probably he is left unnoticed as being a junior subordinate, till the time comes when he can act as an useful agent of his leaders.—**ἐκκλ.** a pagan term appropriated by Christianity. An implicit contrast lies in the following words (so in ii. 14): there were **ἐκκλησίαι** at Thessalonica and elsewhere (*cf.* Chrysostom and Orig., *Cels.* III. xxix.-xxx.) which had not their basis and being **ἐν . . . Χριστῷ.** The latter phrase is a suggestive and characteristic periphrasis for "Christian," and the omission of the **ἐν** before **κυρίῳ,** as of **τῇ** before **ἐν,** is enough to show that the seven words form a unity instead of a double antithesis to "pagan" and "Jewish" respectively.—**κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ,** a new **κύριος** (= dominus) for people like the Thessalonians who were hitherto familiar with the title as applied to Claudius (*cf.* Wilcken's *Griechische Ostraka,* 1899, s.v.) the emperor, or to the God of the Jews (*cf.* Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles,* 260 f.). See the ample discussion in Kattenbusch, *das Apost. Symbol,* ii. 596 f., with his note (pp. 691 f.) on **ἐκκλησία.** The hope and help of God implied that Christians must hold together, under their **κύριος.** "No Christian could have fought his way through the great dark night of idolatry and immorality as an isolated unit; the community was here the necessary condition for all permanent life" (Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity,* i. 189).

Vv. 2-10. *Thanksgiving for the origin and achievements of the church.*—Ver. 2. Whenever Paul was at his prayers, he remembered his friends at Thessalonica; and whenever he recalled them his first feeling was one of gratitude to God (see iii. 9) for the Christian record which, as individuals and as a church (**πάντων**), they displayed of active faith (i. 4-10, ii. 13-16), industrious love (iv. 9 f.), and tenacious hope (v. 1-11). And not Paul alone. The plural implies that all three missionaries prayed together.—**εὐχαριστοῦμεν.** The greeting is followed, as in ordinary letters of the period, by a word of gratitude and good wishes. **εὐχ.** is common in votive inscriptions, in connection with thanksgiving to a god. But while Paul, in dictating his letter, starts with a conventional epistolary form, the phrase immediately expands loosely into **μνημ . . . θεοῦ** (**μνείαν π.** as frequently in ethnic phraseology).

Ver. 3. **ἀδιαλ.** Neither distance nor fresh interests make any difference to his

οντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς [h] ἀγάπης καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς [h] ἐλπίδος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [i] ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν· 4. [k] εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ [l] ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν· 5. ὅτι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ [m] ἐγενήθη [n] εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν [o] λόγῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν [o] δυνάμει καὶ [p] ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ [q] πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ, καθὼς οἴδατε οἷοι ἐγενήθημεν ἐν ὑμῖν δι' ὑμᾶς. 6. καὶ ὑμεῖς [r] μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε [s] καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, [r] δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον ἐν [r] θλίψει πολλῇ μετὰ [t] χαρᾶς

h See on 2 Cor. ii. 4 and Heb. vi. 10-11. With gen. as Rom. v. 2; *cf.* Win. § 30. 12, e.
i *Cf.* iii. 9, 13 and other side in II. i. 4.
k *Cf.* iii. 5.
l II. ii. 13. See Col. iii. 12 and Deut. xxxiii. 12.
m Blass, § 20, 1.
n Gal. iii. 14.
o *Cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 1-4, iv. 19-20.
p "At most of rhetorical value" (Sx. *Lang. N.T.* 158).
q Clem. Rom. xlii. 3.
r *Cf.* Introd. § 1, 1; ii. 13-14, and on 2 Cor. xi. 4.
s 1 Cor. xi. 1.
t Rom. xiv. 17; Gal. v. 22.

affection; his life is bound up with their welfare; his source of happiness is their Christian well-being (*cf.* ii. 17-20, iii. 7-10). The adverb (a late Greek formation, *cf. Expos.*, 1908, 59) goes equally well with the preceding or with the following words; better with the former, on the whole, as the participles then open the successive clauses in 2, 3 and 4.—**ὑμῶν** is prefixed for emphasis to the three substantives which it covers, while the closing **ἔμπροσθεν . . . ἡμῶν** (*cf.* ii. 19) gathers up the thought of **μνημον.**—Faith in one sense is a work, but Paul here (as in Gal. v. 6) means faith that does work (*opus* opponitur sermoni *inani*, Bengel), by producing a change of life and a cheerful courage under trials. It would be no pleasure to recall a merely formal or voluble belief, any more than a display of Christian love (*cf.* Col. i. 4) which amounted simply to emotions or fitful expressions of goodwill, much less a hope which could not persist in face of delay and discouraging hardships.

Ver. 4. The practical evidence of the Spirit in their lives showed that God had willed to enrol them among His chosen people (note the O.T. associations of *beloved by God* and *election*), just as the same consciousness of possessing the Spirit gave them the sure prospect of final entrance into the Messianic realm—an assurance which (ver. 6) filled them with joy amid all their discomforts. The phenomenon of the Spirit thus threw light backwards on the hidden purpose of God for them, and forwards on their prospect of bliss.—Recollections depend on knowledge; to be satisfied about a person implies settled convictions about his character and position. The apostles feel certain that the Thessalonian Christians had been truly chosen and called by God, owing to (*a*) the genuineness and effectiveness of their own ministry at Thessalonica, where they had felt the gospel going home to many of the inhabitants, and (*b*) the genuine evidence of the Thessalonians' faith; (*a*) comes first in ver. 5, (*b*) in vv. 6 f. In ii. 1 f. Paul reverts to (*a*), while in ii. 13-16 (*b*) is again before his mind. As the divine **ἐκλογή** manifested itself in the Christian qualities of ver. 3, Paul goes back to their historical origin.

Ver. 5. **ὅτι** = "inasmuch as".—**τὸ εὐαγγ. ἡμῶν,** the gospel of which the apostles, and by which their hearers, were convinced. As the **καθὼς** clause indicates, **πληροφ.** must here denote personal conviction and unfaltering confidence on the part of the preachers. The omission of the **ἐν** before **πληρ.** throws that word and **πνεύματι** together into a single conception, complementary to **δυνάμει,** which here has no specific reference to miracles, but to the apostles' courage (ii. 2), honesty and sincerity (4, 5), devotion (7, 8), earnestness (9), and consistency (10). The effect of the Spirit on the preachers is followed up (in ver. 6) by its effect on the hearers; and this dual aspect recurs in ver. 9 (we and you). **ἐν** (om. Blass) **ὑμῖν** = "among you".

Ver. 6. **θλίψει . . . χαρᾶς,** *cf.* for this paradox of experience, Mazzini's account of his comrades in the Young Italy movement: "We were often in real want, but we were light-hearted in a way and smiling because we believed in the future". The gladness of the primitive Christian lay in the certainty of possessing soon that full salvation of which the Spirit at present was the pledge and foretaste. In view of Ps. li. 13, 14 it is hardly correct to say, with Gunkel (*Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, 71), that this connection of joy and the Spirit was entirely foreign to Judaism.

Πνεύματος [c]Ἁγίου, 7. ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς [u]τύπον [1] πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύ- u 1 Pet. v. 3. *Cf.*
ουσιν ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ. 8. ἀφ' ὑμῶν γὰρ [v]ἐξήχη- Phil. iii. 17.
ται ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ Ἀχαΐᾳ [w]ἀλλὰ v ἀπ. λεγ., *cf.* Joel
ἐν [x]παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ [y]πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐξελήλυθεν, ὥστε iii. 14 (LXX); 3 Macc.
μὴ [z]χρείαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν τι. 9. [a]αὐτοὶ γὰρ περὶ [b]ἡμῶν ἀπ- iii. 2.
αγγέλλουσιν ὁποίαν [c]εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ πῶς [d]ἐπεστρέψατε w Blass, § 77, 13.
[e]πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων, δουλεύειν Θεῷ [f]ζῶντι καὶ [g]ἀληθινῷ x *Cf.* 1 Cor.
10. καὶ [h]ἀναμένειν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ [i]ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ i. 2; Acts xviii. 1 f.
τῶν νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦν, τὸν [k]ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς [l]ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης. y Rom. i. 8; Clem. Rom. xxxv. 5,

Philemon 5: = "the fact of your faith in God". z iv. 9, v. 1. a "people, wherever we go". b *i.e.*, us, apostles. c *Cf.* Ps. cxx. (cxxi.) 8; LXX. d See on Acts xiv. 15. *Cf.* Jer. iii. 22 (LXX). e *Cf.* Eph. ii. 12. f See on Rev. vii. 2. g See on John vi. 57; Rev. iii. 7, etc. Only here in Paul. h Isa. lix. 11, 20; Æsch., *Eum.*, 243. i Phil. iii. 20. k *Cf.* Burton, M.T. 429, and on 2 Cor. i. 10. l Rom. v. 9; *cf.* below, v. 9 (negat. side of ἐκλογή).

[1] For **τυπους** (ℵACGKLP, g, syr.P, Chrys., Theod., etc., Calvin, Schott, Alexander, Koch, Wohl., Zim.), conformed to **υμας**, read **τυπον** with BD* vss., edd.

Ver. 8. **ἡ πίστις . . . ἐξελ.** (Rom. x. 18), by anacoluthon, reiterates for emphasis **ἀφ' ὑμῶν . . . κυρίου (ὁ λόγος τ. Κ.** depending for its effectiveness on the definite testimony of Christians). Paul is dictating loosely but graphically. The touch of hyperbole is pardonable and characteristic (*cf.* Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. iv. 17; Col. i. 6); but the geographical and commercial position of Thessalonica see Introd., p. 5) must have offered ample facilities for the rapid dissemination of news and the promulgation of the faith, north and south, throughout European Greece (*Encycl. Bibl.*, i. 32). The local Christians had taken full advantage of their natural opportunities. Through their imitation of the apostles (see Introd., p. 7) and of Christ (here as in 1 Peter ii. 19-21, in his sufferings), they had become a pattern for others. The **ἐν τῇ** is omitted before **Ἀχαΐᾳ** here because **M.** and **A.** are grouped together, over against **π. τ.—ὥστε . . . γάρ**, the reputation of the apostles rested upon solid evidence.

Ver. 9. The positive and negative aspects of faith: "Videndum est ut ruinam errorum sequatur aedificium fidei" (Calvin).—**ἀληθινῷ** = "real" as opposed to false in the sense of "counterfeit".—**ζῶντι**, as opposed to dead idols (see above, p. 5) impotent to help their worshippers. Elsewhere the phrase (*cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 12) "implies a contrast with the true God made practically a dead deity by a lifeless and rigid form of religion" (Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, 173). Nothing brings home the reality of God (*i.e.*, as Father, vv. 1-3) to the Christian at first so much as the experience of forgiveness.

Ver. 10. In preaching to pagans, the leaders of the primitive Christian mission put the wrath and judgment of God in the forefront (*cf.* Sabatier's *Paul*, 98 f.), making a sharp appeal to the moral sense, and denouncing idolatry (*cf.* Sap., xiv., 12 f., 22 f.). Hence the revival they set on foot. They sought to set pagans straight, and to keep them straight, by means of moral fear as well as of hope. Paul preached at Thessalonica as he did at Athens (Acts xvii. 29-31; see Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 108 f.) and the substance of his mission-message on the wrath of God is preserved in Rom. i. 18—ii. 16. The *living* God is manifested by His raising of Jesus from the dead, His awakening of faith in Christians, and His readiness to judge human sin in the hereafter. Seeberg (*der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, 82-85) finds here an echo of some primitive Christian formula of faith, but his proofs are very precarious.—**τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.** This marked them out from Jewish proselytes, who might also be said to have turned from idols to serve the living God. The quiet combination of monotheism and a divine position of Jesus is striking (*cf.* Kattenbusch, *op. cit.*, ii. 550 f.).—**ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν . . . ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν**, both the hope and the historical fact lay outside the experience of the Thessalonians, but both were assured to them by their experience of the Spirit which the risen Jesus had bestowed, and which guaranteed His final work. Were it not for touches like the

II. 1. Αὐτοὶ γὰρ [a] οἴδατε, ἀδελφοί, τὴν εἴσοδον ἡμῶν τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, [b] οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν· 2. ἀλλὰ προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες, καθὼς οἴδατε, ἐν [c] Φιλίπποις, [d] ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα ἐν τῷ Θεῷ [e] ἡμῶν λαλῆσαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πολλῷ [f] ἀγῶνι. 3. ἡ γὰρ [g] παράκλησις ἡμῶν [h] οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης, οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας, οὐδὲ [1] ἐν δόλῳ, 4. ἀλλὰ καθὼς [k] δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ [l] πιστευθῆναι

a = "remember," as 1 Cor. i. 16 (*cf.* Field, 187).
b *Cf.* i. 5, and 1 Cor. xv. 10.
c See on Acts xvi. 19 f.
d See on Eph. vi. 20 and Acts ix. 26; on form *cf.* Win. § 5. 26 b.
e iii. 9; II. i. 11-12.
f *Cf.* Phil. i. 30.
g "appeal" (*cf.* Polyb. iii. 109, 6).
h Sc. *ἐστίν*, *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 8.
i 2 Cor. iv. 2 and xii. 16.
k 2 Macc. iv. 3.
l *Cf.* Gal. ii. 7.

[1] The second **ουδε** (ℵABCD*GP, min., etc., edd.) [*cf.* II. iii. 7-8] is preferable to the v. 1. **οὔτε** (Pelt, Hofm., Wohl.); for **ακαθαρσιας**, Bentl. conj. "forte **εξ ἀν. αρεσκιας**" [*i.e.* **ανθρωπαρεσκιας**].

deeper sense of **δουλεύειν**, the celestial origin of Jesus, and the eschatological definition of **ὀργή**, one might be tempted to trace a specious resemblance between this two-fold description of Christianity at Thessalonica and the two cardinal factors in early Greek religion, *viz.*, the service of the Olympian deities (**θεραπεύειν**) and the rites of aversion (**ἀποπομπαί**) which were designed to deprecate the dark and hostile powers of evil. Paul preached like the Baptist judgment to come. But his gospel embraced One who baptised with the Spirit and with the fire of enthusiastic hope (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 7).

CHAPTER II.—VV. 1-12. An *apologia pro vita et labore suo.*

Ver. 1. **αὐτοί**, as opposed to the **α.** of i. 9.—**γέγονεν κ.τ.λ.**, our mission was a vital success, as its results still show. For its motives and methods were genuine (2-12).

Ver. 2. "Though we had suffered—aye and suffered outrage" in one town, yet on we went to another with the same errand; a practical illustration of Matt. x. 23.

Ver. 3. **γάρ**: Our mission (whatever that of others may be) is not the outcome of self-seeking, otherwise it would readily be checked by such untoward circumstances. Our confidence is in *God*, not in ourselves; our work is not self-appointed but a sacred trust or commission, for which we are responsible to Him (4). Hence, discouragement and hesitation are impossible. Paul argues that the very fact of their cheerful perseverance at Thessalonica, after their bad treatment at Philippi, points to the divine source and strength of their mission; what impelled them was simply a sense of lasting responsibility to God, upon the one hand, and an overpowering devotion to men upon the other (*cf.* the **δι' ὑμᾶς** of i. 5), for the gospel's sake. Had the apostles yielded to feelings of irritation and despondency, giving up their task in Macedonia, after the troubles at Philippi, or had they conducted themselves at Thessalonica in such a way as to secure ease and profit; in either case, they would have proved their mission to be ambitious or selfish, and therefore undivine. As it was, their courage and sincerity were at once the evidence and the outcome of their divine commission.—**πλάνης**, "error" (*cf.* Armitage Robinson on Eph. iv. 14). Their preaching did not spring from some delusion or mistake. Paul was neither fool nor knave, neither deceived nor a deceiver (**δόλῳ**). Nor was his mission a sordid attempt (**ἀκαθαρσίας**) to make a good thing out of preaching, the impure motive being either to secure money (*cf.* **πλεονεξίας** ver. 5, and ver. 9), or to gain a position of importance (ver. 6) and popularity. *Cf.* Tacit., *Annal.*, vi, 21 (of Tiberius' attitude to astrologers) "si uanitatis aut fraudum suspicio incesserat". Both features were only too familiar in the contemporary conduct of wandering sophists, **ἀρεταλόγοι**, and thaumaturgists (*e.g.*, Acts xiii. 10, and Clemen's article in *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift*, 1896, 151 f.) whose practices would also explain the literal interpretation of **ἀκ.** (= sensuality). But the context favours the associations of greed (*cf.* Eph. v. 3), as in the case of **πλεονεξία**. On the persuasiveness of sincerity in a speaker, *i.e.*, the extent to which his effectiveness depends upon his hearers' conviction of his own earnestness and honesty, see Aristotle's analysis of **ἠθικὴ πίστις** (*Rhet.*, ii. 1) and Isocrates' description of **εὐνοίας δύναμις** (*Orat.*, xv. 278, 279).

Ver. 4. "As God, who tests our hearts, has attested our fitness to be

τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὕτω λαλοῦμεν, οὐχ [m] ὡς ἀνθρώποις [n] ἀρέσκοντες, ἀλλὰ [o] Θεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. 5. οὔτε γάρ ποτε ἐν λόγῳ [p] κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, καθὼς οἴδατε, οὔτε ἐν [q] προφάσει πλεονεξίας · Θεὸς μάρτυς · 6. οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων [r] δόξαν, οὔτε ἀφ' ὑμῶν οὔτε [s] ἀπ' ἄλλων, [t] δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι · 7. ἀλλ' ἐγενήθημεν [u] ἤπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, ὡς [v] ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα · [1] 8. οὕτως ὁμειρόμενοι ὑμῶν [w] εὐδοκοῦμεν [x] μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν [y] οὐ μόνον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς, [p] Here only (N.T.),

m Causal (*see* Viteau, i. 304). n Gal. i. 10; for οὐ with ptc. *see* Moult. i. 231. o Contrast ver. 15, and *cf.* Sap. i. 5-6.

Win.-Schm. § v. 13c. q "any pretext," *cf.* on 2 Cor. xi. 12, ii. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 3. r *Cf.* John viii. 50, v. 41-44. s *e.g.* i. 9. t *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 1 f. u of a father (ver. 11) in *e.g.* Hom. *Iliad*, xxiv. 770, *Odyssey*, ii. 234. v = ὅταν (Viteau, i. 217). w iii. 1; see on Rom. xv. 26; = "we were right willing". x Rom. i. 11. So. 2 Cor. viii. 5 (force of this example). y *Cf.* Burton, M.T. 481.

[1] The important variant **νηπιοι,** which is even better attested (*cf.* WH ii. 128), and is adopted, *e.g.*, by Bentley, Lachm., Schrader, Jowett, Zimmer, Bisping, WH, Lgft., and Wohl., probably arose from a not uncommon dittography of the final N in the preceding word: **ηπιος** "properly implies the kindness of a superior" (Liddell and Scott s.v.), whereas **νηπιος** has usually associations of immaturity in Paul.

entrusted with the gospel," a characteristic play on the word. The definite commission of the gospel excluded any weak attempt to flatter men's prejudices or to adapt oneself to their tastes. Hence the thought of the following verse.

Ver. 5. "Never did we resort to words of flattery" (in order to gain some private end); *cf.* Arist., *Eth. Nik.*, iv. 6. As self-interest is more subtle than the desire to please people (which may be one form of self-interest), the appeal is changed significantly from **κ. ο.** to **θεὸς μάρτυς** (Rom. i. 9): "auaritia aut ambitio, duo sunt isti fontes ex quibus manat totius ministerii corruptio" (Calvin). *Cf.* Introduction, § 1—on **θεός** and **ὁ θεός,** *cf.* Kattenbusch, *das Apost. Symbol*, ii. 515 f.

Ver. 6. To put a full stop after **ἄλλων,** and begin a new sentence with **δυνάμενοι** (so *e.g.*, Vulgate, Calvin, Koppe, Weizsäcker, H. J. Gibbins, *Exp. Ti.*, xiv. 527), introduces an awkward asyndeton, makes **ἀλλὰ** follow a concessive participle very awkwardly, and is unnecessary for the sense.

Ver. 7. **ἐν βάρει εἶναι** = "be men of weight," or "be a burden" on your funds. Probably both meanings are intended, so that the phrase (*cf.* Field, 199) resumes the ideas of **πλεον.** and **ἀνθ. δόξαν** (self-interest in its mercenary shape and as the love of reputation) which are reiterated in vv. 7-12, a defence of the apostles against the charges, current against them evidently in some circles (probably pagan) at Thessalonica, of having given themselves airs and unduly asserted their authority, as well as of having levied or at any rate accepted contributions for their own support.—**ἀπόστολοι** were known to any of the local Christians who had been Jews (*cf.* Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 66 f., 409 f.), since agents and emissaries (**ἀπόστολοι**) from Jerusalem went to and fro throughout the synagogues: but **ἀ. Χριστοῦ** was a new conception. The Christian **ἀπόστολοι** had their commission from their heavenly messiah.—**ἤπιοι** (2 Tim. ii. 24); as Bengel observes, there was nothing *ex cathedra* about the apostles, nothing selfish or crafty or overbearing. All was tenderness and devotion, fostering and protecting care, in their relations to these Thessalonian Christians who had won their hearts. To eschew flattery (5) did not mean any indifference to consideration and gentleness, in their case; they were honest without being blunt or masterful.—**τροφός,** a nursing mother (*cf.* Hor., *Ep.* i. 4, 8). "In the love of a brave and faithful man there is always a strain of maternal tenderness; he gives out again those beams of protecting fondness which were shed on him as he lay on his mother's knee" (George Eliot). Rutherford happily renders: "On the contrary, we carried ourselves among you with a childish simplicity, as a mother becomes a child again when she fondles her children".

Ver. 8. **ὁμειρόμενοι** (*cf.* Job iii. 21, LXX; Ps. lxii. 2, Symm.) = "yearning

z *Cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 5.
a *Cf.* II. iii. 8 and 2 Cor. xi. 27.
b *Cf.* Acts xviii. 3.
c *Cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 13 for constr.
d *Cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 5.
e 1 Sam. xii. 3; Num. xvi. 15; Acts xx. 23.
f Only here in N.T., = "piously". *Cf.* Eph. iv. 24.

διότι [z] ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε. 9. μνημονεύετε γὰρ, ἀδελφοί, τὸν [a] κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν [a] μόχθον· νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας [b] ἐργαζόμενοι [c] πρὸς τὸ μὴ [d] ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν, ἐκηρύξαμεν εἰς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. 10. ὑμεῖς [e] μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ Θεός, ὡς [f] ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ [g] ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν, 11. καθάπερ οἴδατε, ὡς [h] ἕνα ἕκαστον ὑμῶν, ὡς πατὴρ τέκνα ἑαυτοῦ, [i] παρακαλοῦντες ὑμᾶς καὶ [i] παραμυθούμενοι 12. καὶ [k] μαρτυρόμενοι [l] εἰς τὸ [l] περιπατεῖν ὑμᾶς [l] ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ [m] καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ [n] δόξαν.

g *Cf.* v. 23 (Clem. Rom. xliv. 4). h See on Acts xx. 31. i *Cf.* iv. 1 and on 1 Cor. xiv. 3, with 2 Macc. xv. 8-9. k Eph. iv. 17; see on Acts xx. 26 and Gal. v. 3. l See on Phil. i. 27; ethnic phrase (Deissm. 248). m See on Rom. viii. 28. ix. 11 and Gal. v. 8. n *Cf.* II. ii. 14. o As well as i. 2 f. p i. 3. q *Cf.* Heb. iv. 2. ἀκ. = id quod auditur. r With λόγον, *cf.* Win. § 30. 12d. s *Cf.* i. 6. t *i.e.* the word.

13. Καὶ διὰ [o] τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ [p] ἀδιαλείπτως, ὅτι παραλαβόντες [q] λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν [r] τοῦ Θεοῦ [s] ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθῶς λόγον Θεοῦ, [t] ὃς καὶ

[1] μαρτυρομενοι (ℵBDᵇᶜHKL, 17, 47, Chrys., Dam., etc., edd.) is preferable to the passive variant μαρτυρουμενοι, a corrupt western reading which has been conformed to παραμ.

for, or, over". εὐδοκ., for absence of augment *cf.* W. H., ii. 161, 162.—διότι causal ("for as much as"), almost = γάρ (as in Modern Greek).

Ver. 9. "Paul means by the phrase, *night and day*, that he started work before dawn; the usage is regular and frequent. He no doubt began so early in order to be able to devote some part of the day to preaching" (Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 85). Paul, to the very last (*cf.* Acts xx. 29 f.), seems to have been sensitive on this point of independence.

Ver. 10. "We made ourselves yours" (*cf.* 8), the dative going closely (as Rom. vii. 3) with the verb, which is qualified (as in 1 Cor. xvi. 10) by the adverbs; so Born., Findlay.— ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ. (dative of possession). Paul had met other people at Thessalonica, but only the Christians could properly judge his real character and conduct.

Ver. 11. καθάπερ, sharper than καθώς. Viteau (ii. 111) suggests that κ. ο. is a parenthesis, and ὡς a causal introductory particle for the participles ("heartening," "encouraging," "adjuring") which in their turn depend on ὑμῖν . . . ἐγενήθημεν, but the likelihood is that in the rush of emotion, as he dictates, Paul leaves the participial clause without a finite verb (so *e.g.*, 2 Cor. vii. 5).—ὡς πατὴρ κ.τ.λ. (*cf.* ὡς ἐὰν τροφός, 7). The figure was used by Jewish teachers of their relationship to their pupils. *Cf. e.g.*, the words of Eleazar b. Azarja to his dying master, "Thou art more to Israel than father or mother; they only bring men into this world, whereas thou guidest us for this world and the next". Catullus, lxxii. 4 (dilexi tum te non tantum ut uulgus amicam, sed pater ut natos diligit et generos).

Ver. 12. ἀξίως in this connection (see references) was a familiar ethnic phrase. C. Michel (in his *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*, 1900, 266, 413) quotes two pre-Christian instances with τῶν θεῶν.—εἰς τὸ, κ.τ.λ., grammatically meaning either the object or the content of the solemn charge (*cf.* Moulton, 218 f.). The ethic is dominated by the eschatology, as in iii. 13, v. 23.

Vv. 13-16. *Further thanksgiving for their endurance of trial.*

Ver. 13. "And for this we also render thanks, *viz.*, that;" the καί, by a loose but not unusual (*cf.* iii. 5; Rom. iii. 7, v. 3, etc.) construction, goes not with the pronoun but with the verb, or simply emphasises the former (*e.g.*, Soph., *Oed. Col.*, 53, 520, etc.).—τοῦ θεοῦ comes in so awkwardly that one is tempted to regard it, with Baljon and some other Dutch critics, as a scribal gloss.

[u] ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. 14. ὑμεῖς [v] γὰρ μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε, ἀδελφοί, [w] τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ [w] Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων [x] συμφυλετῶν, [y] καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, 15. τῶν καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἀποκτεινάντων Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοὺς [z] προφήτας [1] καὶ ἡμᾶς [a] ἐκδιωξάντων καὶ Θεῷ μὴ [b] ἀρεσκόντων καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίων, 16. [c] κωλυόντων ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἔθνεσι λαλῆσαι [b] ἵνα σωθῶσιν, [d] εἰς τὸ [e] ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας πάντοτε[· [f] ἔφθασε δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ [g] ὀργὴ [h] εἰς τέλος].

17. Ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, [i] ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας ([k] προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ) [1] περισσοτέρως ἐσπουδάσαμεν τὸ πρόσ-

u "Is made operative" (*cf.* Robinson's *Ephes.* pp. 241 f.).
v Proof and result of ἐνεργεῖται.
w Gal. i. 22; 2 Cor. i. 1.
x Only here in N.T., = "compatriots".
y = ἄπερ.
z Matt. v. 12, xxiii. 34, etc.
a So Lk. xi. 49 (Acts xvii. 5-14). *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 24, 26.
b 1 Cor. x. 33. *Cf.* on Eph. ii. 12.
c Lk. xi. 52; Acts xvii. 5, xxii. 22.
d *Cf.* Burton, M.T. 411 and Moult. i. 219.
e 2 Macc. vi. 14. *Cf.* Sap. xii. 27 and Gen. xv. 16.
f *Cf.* Phil. iii. 16, etc.
g Lk. xiv. 21, xxi. 23. *Cf.* on Rom. i. 18.
h "Utterly, completely" (Ps. Sol. i. 1, ii. 5; Joseph. *B. J.* vii. 8, 1), alm. = "to the bitter end" (Abbott, *Joh. Gramm.* 2322).
i Here only (N.T.): = "bereft," *cf.* Field 199 f.
k 1 Cor. v. 3; 2 Cor. v. 12.
l Gal. i. 14; 2 Cor. i. 12.

[1] Om. the Syrian interpolation **ιδιους** with ℵABD*GP (min.), sah., cop., arm., aeth., Orig., Euth., edd., as an insertion by Marcion (Tert., *cf.* Nestle's *Einf.* 253) before **προφητας**.

Ver. 14. **μιμηταί,** and soon helpers (Rom. xv. 26). The fact that they were exposed to persecution, and bore it manfully, proved that the gospel was a power in their lives, and also that they were in the legitimate succession of the churches. Such obstacles would as little thwart their course as they had thwarted that of Jesus or of his immediate followers. **συμφ.** might include Jews (Acts xvii. 6), but Gentiles predominate in the writer's mind.—The **καί** after **καθώς** simply emphasises the comparison (as in iv. 5, 13). As Calvin suggests, the Thessalonians may have wondered why, if this was the true religion, it should be persecuted by the Jews, who had been God's people. **σ.** is racial rather than local, but the local persecution may have still been due in part to Jews (*cf.* Zimmer, pp. 16 f.).

Ver. 15. "The Lord, even Jesus" (*cf.* Acts ii. 36). **προφ.** may go either with **ἀποκτ.** or with **ἐκδιωξάντων.**

Ver. 16. **κωλυόντων κ.τ.λ.,** defining (Luke xi. 52) from the Christian standpoint that general and familiar charge of hatred to the human race (**ἐναντίων κ.τ.λ.**) which was started by the exclusiveness of the ghetto and the synagogue. —**ἔφθασε κ.τ.λ.,** "the Wrath has come upon them," apparently a reminiscence of Test. Levi. vi. 11. This curt and sharp verdict on the Jews sprang from Paul's irritation at the moment. The apostle was in no mood to be conciliatory. He was suffering at Corinth from persistent Jewish attempts to wreck the Christian propaganda, and he flashes out in these stern sentences of anger. Later on (Rom. ix.-xi.) he took a kinder and more hopeful view, though even this did not represent his final outlook on the prospects of Judaism. Consequently, it is arbitrary to suspect vv. 14 (15)-16 as a later interpolation, written after 70 A.D. (*cf.* the present writer's *Hist. New Testament*, pp. 625, 626). But the closing sentence of ver. 16 has all the appearance of a marginal gloss, written after the tragic days of the siege in 70 A.D. (so *e.g.*, Spitta, Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, i. 128, 129, Schmiedel, Teichmann, *die Paul. Vorstellungen von Auferstehung u. Gericht*, 83, Drummond, etc.). The Jews, no doubt, had recently suffered, and were suffering, as a nation in a way which might seem to Paul, in a moment of vehement feeling, a clear proof of condign punishment (so *e.g.*, Schmidt, 86-90). But neither the edict of Claudius nor the bloody feuds in Palestine quite bear out the language of this verse. And **ὀργή** is surely more than judicial hardening (*cf.* Dante's *Paradiso*, vi. 88-93); its eschatological significance points to a more definite interpretation.

Ver. 17-CHAPTER III. Ver. 13. Paul's *apologia pro absentia suâ.*

Ver. 17. **πρὸς κ. ὥ.,** as we both expected, but, as it turned out, for much longer. **προσ. οὐ κ.,** "not where I

ωπον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ. 18. [m] διότι ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐγὼ [n] μὲν Παῦλος καὶ [o] ἅπαξ καὶ [o] δίς, καὶ [p] ἐνέκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς. 19. τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπὶς ἢ [q] χαρὰ ἢ [q] στέφανος [r] καυχήσεως [s](ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς) ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ [t] Κυρίου ἡμῶν [t] Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ; 20. ὑμεῖς γάρ ἐστε [u] ἡ [v] δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά.

m Win. § 5, 7, d, *cf.* on ii. 8.
n = "For my part"; on absence of δέ, *cf.* Blass, § 77, 12.
o = "More than once" (Phil. iv. 16).
p *Cf.* Gal. v. 7; Rom. xv. 22.
q Phil. iv. 1.
r *Cf.* Prov. xvi. 31 (LXX).
s Blass, § 77, 11.
t *Cf.* Kattenbusch: *das Apost. Symbol*, ii. 597 f.
u Win. § 18, 8, d.
v 2 Cor. viii. 23, *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 14.

breathe; but where I love, I live" (Southwell, the Elizabethan Jesuit poet, echoing Augustine's remark that the soul lives where it loves, not where it exists); *cf.* Eurip., *Ion*, 251. The next paragraph, ii. 17-iii. 13, starts from a fresh imputation against the apostles' honour. Paul, it was more than hinted by calumniators at Thessalonica, had left his converts in the lurch (*cf.* 18); with him, out of sight was out of mind; fresh scenes and new interests in the South had supplanted them in his affections, and his failure to return was interpreted as a fickle indifference to their concerns. The reply is three-fold. (*a*) Paul's continued absence had been unavoidable (17 f.); he had often tried to get back. In proof of this anxiety (*b*) he had spared Timothy from his side for a visit to them (iii. 1-5), and (*c*) Timothy's report, he adds (iii. 6 f.) had relieved a hearty concern on his part for their welfare; he thus lets them see how much they were to him, and still prays for a chance of re-visiting them (11). He was not to blame for the separation; and, so far from blunting his affection, it had only whetted (**περισσοτέρως**) his eagerness to get back.

Ver. 18. "We did crave to reach you," **διότι** (= because) not being required with the English stress on *did*. The whole verse is parenthetical, syntactically. — **καὶ . . . Σατανᾶς.** The mysterious obstacle, which Paul traced back to the ultimate malice of Satan, may have been either (*a*) an illness (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 7, so Simon, *die Psychologie des Apostels Paulus*, 63, 64), (*b*) local troubles, (*c*) the exigencies of his mission at the time being (Grotius), or (*d*) a move on the part of the Thessalonian politarchs who may have bound over Jason and other leading Christians to keep the peace by pledging themselves to prevent Paul's return (Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller*, 230 f., Woodhouse, *E. Bi.*, 5047, Findlay). Early Christian thought referred all such hindrances to the devil as the opponent of God and of God's cause. The words **ἐν Ἀθήναις** (iii. 1) rule out Zimmer's application of (*b*) to the emergency at Corinth, while the silence of Acts makes any of the other hypotheses quite possible, though (*d*) hardly fits in with the ordinary view of the Empire in II. ii. 2 f. and renders it difficult to see why the Thessalonians did not understand at once how Paul could not return. The choice really lies between (*a*) and (*c*). Kabisch (27-29), by a forced exegesis, takes ver. 20 as the explanation of this satanic manœuvre. Satan prevented us from coming, in order to rob us of our glory and praise on the last day, by wrecking your Christian faith; he was jealous of our success among you.

Ver. 19. Of course we wanted to come back, for (**γάρ**), etc. The touch of fine exaggeration which follows is true to the situation. Paul's absence from the young church was being misinterpreted in a sinister way, as if it implied that the Achaian Christians had ousted the Thessalonians from his affections. *You it is*, he protests, *who but you* (**καὶ** superfluous after **ἤ**, as in Epict. i. 6, 39; Rom. xiv. 10, but really heightening the following word, as in Rom. v. 7; almost = "indeed" or "even")—*you are my pride and delight!*—**στέφανος**, of a public honour granted (as to Demosthenes and Zeno) for distinguished public service. The metaphor occurs often in the inscriptions (*cf.* also Pirke Aboth, iv. 9). Paul coveted no higher distinction at the arrival of the Lord than the glory of having won over the Thessalonian church. *Cf.* Crashaw's lines to St. Teresa in heaven:

"Thou shalt look round about, and see
Thousands of crown'd souls throng to be
Themselves thy crown".

Παρουσία = royal visit (*cf.* Wilcken's *Griech. Ostraka*, i. 274 f.), and hence applied (*cf.* Matt. xxiv.) to the arrival of the messiah, though the evidence for the

III. 1. Διὸ μηκέτι στέγοντες, [a] ηὐδοκήσαμεν [b] καταλειφθῆναι ἐν Ἀθήναις μόνοι 2. καὶ ἐπέμψαμεν Τιμόθεον τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ [c] συνεργὸν [c] τοῦ Θεοῦ [1] ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ [d] στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς καὶ [d] παρακαλέσαι [e] ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, 3. [f] τὸ μηδένα [g] σαίνεσθαι [2] ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι ταύταις· αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε ὅτι εἰς [h] τοῦτο [i] κείμεθα· 4. καὶ γὰρ ὅτε [k] πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἦμεν, προελέγομεν ὑμῖν ὅτι [l] μέλλομεν θλίβεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ οἴδατε· 5. διὰ τοῦτο [m] κἀγώ μηκέτι στέγων ἔπεμψα [n] εἰς τὸ γνῶναι τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν, μή πως [o] ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων καὶ [p] εἰς κενὸν [q] γένηται ὁ κόπος

a *i.e.* Paul and Silvanus, *cf.* ii. 8. b Acts xxv, 14. c 2 Macc. viii. 7, etc., 1 Cor. iii. 9. d II. ii. 17; *cf.* below, ver. 13. e = περί (*cf.* II. ii. 1; Rom. i. 8; Plato's *Apol.* xxxix. e).

f *Cf.* Viteau, i. 272; Blass, § 71, 2, opposition to preceding clause (*cf.* iv. 6). g Here only (N.T.), = "allured, beguiled" or "disturbed" (Diog. Laert. viii. 43: οἱ δὲ σαινόμενοι τοῖς λεγόμενοις ἐδάκρυον). h *i.e.* τὸ θλίβεσθαι, *cf.* i. 6, II. i. 5. i Phil. i. 16. k = "with" II. iii. 1, 10, etc. l "We Christians." m *Cf.* on ii. 13. n *Cf.* on ii. 16. o Unrealised purpose, see Gal. ii. 2, iv. 11, for mood; also Burton, M.T. 227. p Win. § 29, 2, b. q deliberative conjunctive.

[1] For **ημων και διακονον τ.θ. και συνεργον ημων** (DcKL, syr.sch, Chrys., Theod., Dam., etc.), or **ημων και δ.τ.θ.** (ℵAP, min., vg., cop., syr.ptxt, arm., aeth., Euth., etc., Ti., Tr., Bj., Zim.) read the original and harder Western text **ημων και συνεργον τ.θ.** (D*, d, e, 17, Amb. [B om. **τ.θ.** so Weiss, Findlay], Lach., Al., Ell., WH marg., Born., Schm., Wohl., Feine), from which the variants seem to have sprung. Later scribes are more likely to have stumbled at **τ.θ.** after **συνεργον** than to have inserted it by a reminiscence of 1 Cor. iii. 9.

[2] For **μ. σαινεσθαι** (*cf.* Zahn, *Einl.* § 14, 2), Lach., Ernesti, and Verschuis (so Alexander) conj. **μηδεν ασαινεσθαι** (= **χαλεπῶς φέρειν**), a more than dubious passive form of **ασαω**, Beza and Bentley **μηδενα σαλευεσθαι** (v.l. **σευεσθαι**, Bentl.), and Holwerda **μηδεν αναινεσθαι** (= repent or be ashamed of); if any change is required (but *cf.* Koch's full note, 233-237), it would be in the direction of **σιεινεσθαι** (= **σιαινεσθαι**, to be disheartened, unnerved), the attractive reading of FG which is preferred by Sophocles (Lex., s.v.), Reiske, and Nestle (*Exp. Ti.* xviii. 479, Preuschen's *Zeitschrift*, vii. 361-62, *cf.* Mercati, *ibid.* viii. 242). G elsewhere (*cf.* Rom. xi. 26, xii. 17) confuses **ει** and **αι**.

use of the term in pre-Christian Judaism is scanty (Test. Jud. xxii. 3; Test. Levi. viii. 15; for the idea of the divine "coming" *cf. Slav. En.*, xxxii. 1, xlii. 5). This is the first time the term is used by Paul, but it was evidently familiar to the readers. Later on, possibly through Paul's influence, it became an accepted word for the second advent in early Christianity.

Chapter III.—Ver. 1. **μηκ.**, instead of **οὐκ.**, to bring out the personal motive. —**στέγοντες** "able to bear" (*cf.* Philo, *Flacc.*, § 9, **μηκέτι στέγειν δυνάμενοι τὰς ἐνδείας**), sc. the anxiety of ii. 11 f.—**ἐν Ἀ. μόνοι.** Paul shrank from loneliness, especially where there was little or no Christian fellowship; but he would not gratify himself at the expense of the Thessalonians. Their need of Timothy must take precedence of his.

Ver. 3. *Cf.* Artemid., *Oneirocritica* ii. 11, **ἀλλότριοι δὲ κύνες σαίνοντες μὲν δόλους καὶ ἐνέδρας ὑπὸ πονηρῶν ἀνδρῶν** [*cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 2] **ἢ γυναικῶν** [*cf.* Acts xvii. 4] **σημαίνουσιν.**

Ver. 4. *Cf.* Acts xvii. 3, 6, 13 f.

Ver. 5. Resuming the thought of iii. 1-3*a*, after the parenthetical digression of 3*b*, 4, but adding a fresh reason for the mission of Timothy, *viz.*, the apostle's desire to have his personal anxiety about the Thessalonians relieved. It is needless to suppose (with Hofmann and Spitta) that iii. 5 refers to a fresh messenger or a letter (Wohl.) despatched by Paul on his own account. As in ii. 18, Paul passes to the singular, to emphasise his personal interest in the matter; the change of number, especially after the generic use of the plural in 3, 4, does not necessarily prove that the plural of ver. 1 means Paul alone. The dominating anxiety of Paul was about their faith (5-10). He was overjoyed to hear that they retained "a kindly remembrance" of himself, and he reciprocates their desire for another meeting; but, while this undoubtedly entered into their general Christian position, it is the former on which unselfishly he dwells (*cf.* the transition in 10*a* and 10*b*). —**πίστιν**

ἡμῶν. 6. [r]ἄρτι δὲ ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν καὶ [s]εὐαγγελισαμένου ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ὑμῶν καὶ ὅτι ἔχετε μνείαν ἡμῶν ἀγαθὴν πάντοτε, ἐπιποθοῦντες ἡμᾶς ἰδεῖν, [t]καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς, 7. [u]διὰ τοῦτο παρεκλήθημεν, ἀδελφοί, [v]ἐφ' ὑμῖν ἐπὶ πάσῃ [w]τῇ ἀνάγκῃ καὶ [w]θλίψει ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως· 8. ὅτι νῦν [x]ζῶμεν, [y]ἐὰν ὑμεῖς [z]στήκετε ἐν Κυρίῳ. 9. τίνα γὰρ [a]εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ Θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι περὶ ὑμῶν, ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ ᾗ χαίρομεν δι' ὑμᾶς ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 10. νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας [b]ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ δεόμενοι [c]εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν [d]ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν; 11. [e]Αὐτὸς δὲ [f]ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν [g]Ἰησοῦς κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· 12. ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ Κύριος [h]πλεονάσαι καὶ [i]περισσεύσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας (καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς [k]εἰς ὑμᾶς) 13. εἰς τὸ [l]στηρίξαι [m]ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας [n]ἀμέμπτους ἐν [o]ἁγιωσύνῃ, ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν [g]Ἰησοῦ μετὰ [p]πάντων τῶν [q]ἁγίων αὐτοῦ.

r = "A moment ago," "just".
s *Cf.* Lk. i. 19; in untechnical classical sense of "bringing good news".
t *Cf.* ii. 11, 17.
u resumptive = "by this good news".
v *Cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 7.
w Job xv. 24 (LXX), "we were suffering (*cf.* ver. 3.) as well as you".
x Intensive (*cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 9, xiii. 4: "uiuimus, hoc est recte ualemus" (Calvin).
y = ὅταν, ii. 7.
z II. ii. 15, late form, *cf.* Blass § 65, 4; Win. § 5, 19; Burton, *M.T.* 247, and iii. 23 (Theod.) and v. 13 below.
a *Cf.* on Acts xxiv. 3.
b *Cf.* Dan. Moult. i. 168.
c II. ii. 2; constr. as in ii. 12.
d See note on v. 23.
e *Cf.* iv. 16, and contrast ii. 18.
f *Cf.* Win. § 18, 7, Moult. i. 179.
g II. iii. 5, Lk. i. 79.
h Transit. as Num. xxvi. 54 (LXX), etc.
i Transit. as 2 Cor. ix. 8; *cf.* for thought Phil. i. 9.
k *Sc.* "abound in love".
l *Cf.* above, ver. 2.
m See note on v. 23.
n Proleptic (*cf.* Viteau, II. 275), as v. 23; *cf.* Phil. ii. 15, Clem. Rom. xliv. 6, Sap. ii. 22.
o *Cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 1.
p *Cf.* iv. 17, ἡμεῖς . . . σὺν αὐτοῖς.
q Jude 14, *cf.* Everling: *die paul. Angelologie* (78-79).

κ.τ.λ. "Initium omnium malarum tentationum inconstantia animi est et parua ad Deum confidentia" (*De Imit. Christi*, i. 13, 5).—**ἐπείρασεν,** with success, it is implied.

Ver. 8. The news put life and spirit into him.—**στήκετε,** for construction *cf.* Mark xi. 25 and Abbott's *Johan. Gramm.*, 2515 (i).

Ver. 10. Another adaptation of ethnic phraseology, *cf. Griechische Urkunden*, i. 246, 12, **νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐντυγχάνω τῷ θεῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** (a pagan papyrus from second or third century, A.D.). The connection of **δεόμενοι κ.τ.λ.** with the foregoing words is loose, but probably may be found in the vivid realisation of the Thessalonians called up before his mind as he praised God for their constancy. Timothy had told him of their loyalty, but had evidently acquainted him also with some less promising tendencies and shortcomings in the church; possibly the Thessalonians had even asked for guidance on certain matters of belief and practice (see below). Hence Paul's eagerness to be on the spot again, not merely for the sake of happy fellowship (Rom. i. 11), but to educate and guide his friends, supplying what was defective in their faith. As this was impracticable in the meantime, he proceeds to write down some kindly admonitions. Thus 10*b* forms the transition to the second part of the letter; Paul, as usual, is wise enough to convey any correction or remonstrance on the back of hearty commendation. In the prayer which immediately follows, 10*a* is echoed in 11, 10*b* in 12, 13, for the maturing of the Thessalonian's faith does not depend on the presence of their apostles. Whatever be the answer to the prayer of 11, the prayer of 12, 13 can be accomplished.

Ver. 11. **κατευθύναι** (optative), as already (Acts xvi. 8-10, xvii. 1). The singular (*cf.* II., ii. 16, 17) implies that God and Jesus count as one in this connection. The verb is common (*e.g.*, Ep. Arist., 18, etc.) in this sense of providence directing human actions.

Vv. 12, 13. The security and purity of the Christian life are rested upon its brotherly love (so Ep. Arist., 229); all breaches or defects of **ἁγιωσύνη,** it is implied, are due to failures there (*cf.* iv. 3, 6); even sensuality becomes a form of selfishness, on this view, as much as impatience or resentment. This profound **ἀγάπη** "is an ever-fixed mark That looks

IV. 1. [a] Λοιπὸν οὖν, ἀδελφοί, [b] ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν [c] τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν [d] καὶ [e] ἀρέσκειν Θεῷ, καθὼς καὶ περιπατεῖτε, ἵνα περισσεύητε μᾶλλον· 2. οἴδατε γὰρ τίνας παραγγελίας ἐδώκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 3. [f] τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι [f] θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ

a "Locutio properantis ad finem" (Grotius), Test. Reub. v. 5; *cf.* on 2 Cor. xiii. 11, and Jannaris in *Exp.*[5] viii. 429 f. b Phil. iv. 3. c On article in indir. questions, see Blass, § 47. 5, Viteau, I. 132, Win. § 18, 2. d And so (result). e Contr. ii. 15. f v. 18, Ps. xxix. 5, etc.

on tempests and is never shaken;" it fixes the believing man's life in the very life of God, by deepening its vital powers of growth; no form of **ἁγιωσύνη** which sits loose to the endless obligations of this **ἀγάπη** will stand the strain of this life or the scrutiny of God's tribunal at the end.—**ὑμᾶς δὲ,** what ever becomes of us.—**ἁγίων,** either (*a*) "saints" (as II., i. 10, De Wette, Hofmann, Zimmer, Schmidt, Everling, Kabisch, Findlay, Wohl.), or (*b*) "angels" (Ex. i. 9; Ps. Sol. xvii. 49, etc. Hühn, Weiss, Schrader, Titius, Schmiedel, Lueken), or (*c*) both (*cf.* 4 Esd. vii. 28, xiv. 9; Bengel, Alford, Wohl., Askwith, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Milligan). The reminiscence of Zech. xiv. 5 (LXX) is almost decisive for (*b*), though Paul may have put another content into the term; **πάντων** must not be pressed to support (*c*). In any case, the phrase goes closely with **παρουσίᾳ.** The **ἅγιοι** are a retinue.

CHAPTER IV.-Ver. 1-CHAPTER V.-Ver. 11. *Special instructions* (iv. 1-12) *on chastity, etc.*

Ver. 1. Resuming the thought of ii. 11, 12 as well as of iii. 10-13. *Cf.* a pre-Christian letter in Oxyrh. Papyri, iv. 294 (13 **ἐρωτῶ σε οὖν ἵνα μὴ,** 6 f. **ἐρωτῶ σε καὶ παρακαλῶ σε**). The **ἵνα,** repeated often for the sake of clearness, is sub-final (so II., iii. 12) = infinitive, *cf.* Moulton, i. 206 f. Paul meant to write **οὕτως καὶ περιπατῆτε,** but the parenthesis of praise (**κ. καὶ π.**) leads him to assume that and to plead for fresh progress along the lines already laid down by himself.

Ver. 2. Almost a parenthesis, as Bahnsen points out in his study of 1-12 (*Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 1904, 332-358). The injunctions (**παραγγελίαι** in semi-military sense, as 1 Tim. i. 18) relate to chastity (3-8) and charity, (9, 10), with a postscript against excitement and idleness (11, 12).—**παραγγ.** for the cognate use of this term (*cf.* ver. 8) in the inscriptions of Dionysopolis (**παραγγέλλω πᾶσιν μὴ καταφρονεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ**) *cf. Exp. Ti.*, x. 159.—**διὰ κ.τ.λ.,** the change from the **ἐν** of ver. 1 does not mean that the Thessalonians before their conversion got such injunctions from Paul on the authority of Christ, while afterwards they simply needed to be reminded of the obligations of their union (**ἐν**) with the Lord. No strict difference can be drawn between both phrases (*cf.* Heitmüller's *Im Namen Jesu*, 71 f.), though the **διά** lays rather more stress on the authority. For Jesus to command **διά** the apostles seems to us more natural than to say that the apostles issue commands **διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου,** but the sense is really the same. The apostles give their orders on the authority of their commission and revelations from the Lord whom they interpret to His followers (*cf.* Rom. xv. 30, xii. 2). But this interpretation must have appealed to the sayings of Jesus which formed part of the **παράδοσις** (*cf.* Weizsäcker's *Apostolic Age*, i. 97, 120, ii. 39). Thus 8*a* is an echo of the saying preserved in Luke x. 16.

Ver. 3. **ἁγιασμός** (in appo ition to **τοῦτο, θέλημα** without the article being the predicate) = the moral issue of a life related to the **Ἅγιος** (*cf.* ver. 8), viewed here in its special and negative aspect of freedom from sexual impurity. The gospel of Jesus, unlike some pagan cults, *e.g.*, that of the Cabiri at Thessalonica (*cf.* Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, pp. 257 f.), did not tolerate, much less foster, licentiousness among its worshippers. At Thessalonica as at Corinth Paul found his converts exposed to the penetrating taint of life in a large seaport. As the context indicates, **ἁγ. ὑμῶν** = "the perfecting of you in holiness" (**ἁγ.** in its active sense, **ὑμῶν** genitive objective: so Lünemann, Ellicott, Bahnsen). The absence of any reference to **δικαιοσύνη** is remarkable. But Paul's dialectic on justification was occasioned by controversies about **ὁ νόμος** which were not felt at Thessalonica. Besides, the "justified" standing of the believer, even in that synthesis of doctrine, amounted practically to the position assured by the possession of the Spirit to the Christian. In his uncontroversial and eschatological mo-

g Acts xv. 20; infin. of apposition, as Acts xv. 28; Sap. ii. 16.
h 1 Pet. iii. 7.
i See Tob. viii. 4-9, and 1 Cor. vii. 39.

ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν, [g]ἀπέχεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς [g]πορνείας· 4. [g]εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ [h]σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι ἐν [i]ἁγιασμῷ καὶ [k]τιμῇ, 5. μὴ ἐν [l]πάθει [k]ἐπιθυμίας, καθάπερ [m]καὶ τὰ ἔθνη [n]τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν Θεόν· 6. [o]τὸ [p]μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν [q]ἐν τῷ [q]πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ· διότι [r]ἔκδικος Κύριος περὶ πάντων τούτων,

k See Heb. xiii. 4 and Ignat. *ad Polyk.* v. 2. l 4 Macc. i. 35. m *Cf.* on ii. 14. n From Jer. x. 25; *cf.* II. i. 8: "whose characteristic is ignorance of God" (Win. § 20, 3 b). o *sc.* τινα from ἕκαστον (4). p *Cf.* iii. 3, for the accus. infin. with neg. to denote purpose. q *Cf.* on 2 Cor. vii. 11. r Ps. xciv. 1, *cf.* Sir. v. 3; Rom. xii. 19, and xiii. 4.

ments, Paul taught as here that the experience of the Spirit guaranteed the believer's vindication at the end (*cf.* i. 9, 10) and also implied his ethical behaviour during the interval. The comparative lack of any allusion to the forgiveness of sins (*cf. e.g.*, iii. 5, 10, 13) does not mean that Paul thought the Thessalonians would be kept sinless during the brief interval till the parousia (so Wernle, *der Christ u. die Sünde bei Paulus*, 25-32); probably no occasion had called for any explicit teaching on this commonplace of faith (1 Cor. xv. 3, 11).

Ver. 4. Paul demands chastity from men; it is not simply a feminine virtue. Contemporary ethics, in the Roman and Greek world, was often disposed to condone marital unfaithfulness on the part of husbands, and to view prenuptial unchastity as **ἀδιάφορον** or at least as a comparatively venial offence, particularly in men (*cf.* Lecky's *History of European Morals*, i. 104 f., ii. 314 f.). The strict purity of Christ's gospel had to be learnt (**εἰδέναι**). — **σκεῦος** (lit. "vessel") = "wife;" the rendering "body" (*cf.* Barn. vii. 3) conflicts with the normal meaning of **κτᾶσθαι** ("get," "acquire;" of marriage, LXX. Ruth iv. 10; Sir. xxxvi. 29, Xen., *Symp.*, ii. 10). Paul views marriage on much the same level as he does in 1 Cor. vii. 2, 9; in its chaste and religious form, it is a remedy against sensual passion, not a gratification of that passion. Each of you (he is addressing men) must learn (**εἰδέναι** = know [how] to, *cf.* Phil. iv. 12) to get a wife of his own (when marriage is in question), but you must marry **ἐν ἁγιασμῷ** (as a Christian duty and vocation) **καὶ τιμῇ** (with a corresponding sense of the moral dignity of the relationship). The two latter words tend to raise the current estimate, presupposed here and in ver. 6, of a wife as the **σκεῦος** of her husband; this in its turn views adultery primarily as an infringement of the husband's rights or an attack on his personal property. Paul, however, closes by an emphatic word on the religious aspect (6-8) of the question; besides, as Dr. Drummond remarks, "is it not part of his greatness that, in spite of his own somewhat ascetic temperament, he was not blind to social and physiological facts?" It is noticeable that his eschatology has less effect on his view of marriage here than in 1 Cor. vii. Even were **κτᾶσθαι** taken as = "possess," a usage not quite impossible for later Greek (*cf.* Field, 72), it would only extend the idea to the duties of a Christian husband. The alternative rendering ("acquire mastery of," Luke xxi. 19) does not justify the "body" sense of **σκεῦος**.

Ver. 6. Compare the saying of rabbi Simon ben Zoma (on Deut. xxiii. 25): "Look not on thy neighbour's vineyard. If thou hast looked, enter not; if thou hast entered, regard not the fruits; if thou hast regarded them, touch them not; if thou hast touched them, eat them not. But if thou hast eaten, then thou dost eject thyself from the life of this world and of that which is to come" (quoted in Bacher's *Agada der Tannaiten*, 2nd ed., 1903, i. 430). There is no change of subject, from licentiousness to dishonesty. The asyndeton and the euphemistic **ἐν τῷ πράγματι** (not **τῳ** = **τινί**, Win. § 64*d*) show that Paul is still dealing with the immorality of men, but now as a form of social dishonesty and fraud. The metaphors are drawn from trade, perhaps as appropriate to a trading community. While **ὑπερβαίνειν** may be intransitive (in its classical sense of "transgress"), it probably governs **ἀδελφόν** in the sense of "get the better of," or "overreach;" **πλεονεκτεῖν** similarly = "overreach," "defraud," "take advantage of" (2 Cor. vii. 2, xii. 17, 18; Xen., *Mem.*, iii. 5, 2; Herod. viii. 112). Compare **ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ** (Eph. iv. 19). The passage (with ver. 8) sounds almost like a vague reminiscence of Test. Asher, ii. 6: **ὁ πλεονεκτῶν τὸν**

καθὼς καὶ [s]προείπαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ [t]διεμαρτυράμεθα. 7. οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς [u]ἐπὶ [v]ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἀλλ' [w]ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. 8. [x]τοι- γαροῦν ὁ ἀθετῶν οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀθετεῖ ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν τὸν διδόντα τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ [y]Ἅγιον [z]εἰς ὑμᾶς. 9. περὶ δὲ τῆς [z]φιλαδελφίας οὐ [a]χρείαν ἔχετε [a]γράφειν ὑμῖν· [1] αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς [b]θεοδίδακτοί ἐστε [c]εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους· 10. καὶ γὰρ ποιεῖτε αὐτὸ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς [d]ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ. παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, [e]περισσεύειν μᾶλλον 11. καὶ [f]φιλοτιμεῖσθαι [g]ἡσυχάζειν καὶ [h]πράσ- [s] *Cf.* Win. § 13, 13. [t] = "Solemnly testified" (*cf.* 1 Tim. v. 21). [u] "With a view to" (*cf.* Eph. ii. 10): object and terms. [v] "Sexual vice" (as Col. iii. 5, Eph. v. 3), Test. Jos. iv. 6. [w] = εἰς (1 Cor. vii. 15; Eph. iv. 4; Win. § 50, 5). [x] Heb. xii. 1. [y] As in Ezek. xxxvii. 14 (LXX). [z] See on Rom. xii. 10. [a] Blass, § 69, 5; 2 Cor. ix. 1; Heb. v. 12. [b] Elaborated in Rom. v. 5; 2 Cor. v. 14, *cf.* Barn. xxi. 6; Isa. liv. 13; Ps. Sol. xvii. 35. [c] Epexegetic infinitive, (Moult. 218-219) of object. [d] Philippi, Berea, etc. [e] Active side of ii. 12. [f] See on 2 Cor. v. 9 and Rom. xv. 20 = "be distinguished for a quiet life," "strive to be quiet". [g] *Cf.* II. iii. 12. [h] = "attend to your own business," *cf.* Dem. *Olynth.* ii. 16.

[1] **ου χ. εχετε γραφειν υμιν** (ℵ*ADc, etc., edd.), an irregular but not uncommon turn ("you have no need of anyone to write you"), corrected in ℵcD*G, vg., Chrys., etc., to **εχομεν κ.τ.λ.** (so Lünem., Lachm., Blass, *cf.* i. 8), and in B to **ειχομεν κ.τ.λ.** (Weiss, Bahnsen), as in H to **γραφεσθαι κ.τ.λ.** (from v. 1).

πλησίον παροργίζει τὸν Θεόν . . . τὸν ἐντολέα τοῦ νόμου Κύριον ἀθετεῖ. Only **τὸν ἀνθ.** here is not the wronged party but the apostles who convey God's orders.—**διότι κ.τ.λ.** = "since (*cf.* ii. 8) the Lord is the avenger (from Deut. xxxii. 35; *cf.* Sap. xii. 12; Sir. xxx. 6; 1 Macc. xiii. 6, **ἐκδικήσω περὶ**; 4 Macc. xv. 29) in all these matters" (of impurity). How, Paul does not explain (*cf.* Col. iii. 5, 6). By a premature death (1 Cor. xi. 30)? Or, at the last judgment (i. 10)? not in the sense of Sap. iii. 16, iv. 6 (illegitimate children evidence at last day against their parents) at any rate.

Ver. 8. Elsewhere (i. 5, 6) **ἅγιον** simply denotes the divine quality of **πνεῦμα** as operating in the chosen **ἅγιοι** of God, but here the context lends it a specific value. Impurity is a violation of the relationship established by the holy God between Himself and Christians at baptism, when the holy Spirit is bestowed upon them for the purpose of consecrating them to live His life (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19). The gift of the Spirit here is not regarded as the earnest of the future kingdom (for which immorality will disquality) so much as the motive and power of the new life.—**διδόντα** = "the giver of," not implying continuous or successive impartation; present as in ch. v. 24; Gal. v. 8. He not only calls, but supplies the atmosphere and energy requisite for the task.—**ἀθετῶν κ.τ.λ.** (*cf.* ii. 13) = contemns by ignoring such injunctions (2-6) in practical life, deliberately sets aside their authority. *Cf.* Isa. xxiv. 16, 17 f., **οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν· οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον, φόβος καὶ βόθυνος καὶ παγὶς ἐφ' ὑμᾶς** (nor shall any escape: *cf.* below on v. 3). In 2 Sam. xii. 9 f. Nathan fixes on the selfishness of David's adultery and charges him especially with *despising the commandment of the Lord.*

Vv. 9-10. **περὶ φιλαδελφίας.** One might have expected that adultery, especially when viewed as selfish greed (*cf.* ver. 6), would have come under **φ.**, but the latter bears mainly here on charity and liberality, a Christian impulse or instinct which seems to have come more naturally to the Thessalonians than ethical purity. "A new creed, like a new country, is an unhomely place of sojourn, but it makes men lean on one another and join hands" (R. L. Stevenson).

Ver 10. Their **ἀγάπη** was no parochial affection, but neither was it to be fussy or showy, much less to be made an excuse for neglecting their ordinary business (11, 12); this would discredit them in the eyes of the busy outside public (**πρὸς** = in intercourse or relations with) and sap their own independence. Such seems the least violent way of explaining the transition in **καὶ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ.** The church was apparently composed, for the most part, of tradesmen and working people (**χερσὶν ὑμῶν**, *cf.* Renan's *S. Paul*, 246 f.) with their families, but there may have been some wealthier members, whose charity was in danger of being abused. *Cf.* Demos., *Olynth.*, iii. 35: **οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπου μηδὲν ἐγὼ ποιοῦσιν τὰ τῶν ποιούντων εἶπον ὡς δεῖ νέμειν, οὐδ' αὐτοὺς μὲν ἀργεῖν καὶ σχολάζειν καὶ ἀπορεῖν.**

Ver. 11. **φιλοτ. ἡσυχάζειν** (oxy-

σειν τὰ ἴδια καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν, καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγείλαμεν· 12. ἵνα περιπατῆτε [i] εὐσχημόνως πρὸς [k] τοὺς ἔξω καὶ [l] μηδενὸς χρείαν ἔχητε.

13. οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων, ἵνα μὴ λυπῆσθε καθὼς [m] καὶ οἱ [n] λοιποὶ [o] οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα. 14. εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη, [p] οὕτω καὶ ὁ Θεὸς

i See on 1 Cor. xiv. 40.
k See on 1 Cor. v. 12.
l Neuter (Heb. v. 12, etc.).
m *Cf.* note on ii. 14.
n *i.e.* pagans as in Eph. ii. 3, *cf.* Sap. ii. 1 f.
o *Cf.* Theogn. 567, *Iph. Aul.* 1250, Sap. ii. 22, iii. 18.
p *i.e.* "then it follows that".

moron). The prospect of the second advent (iv. 13 f., v. 1-10) seems to have made some local enthusiasts feel that it was superfluous for them to go on working, if the world was to be broken up immediately. This feverish symptom occupies Paul more in the diagnosis of his second letter, but it may have been present to his mind here. For instances of this common phase in unbalanced minds compare the story of Hippolytus (*Comm. Dan.*, iv. 19) about a Pontic bishop in the second century who misled his people by prophesying the advent within six months, and also a recent outburst of the same superstition in Tripoli (*Westminster Gazette*, Nov., 1899) where "the report that the end of the world will come on November 13" produced "an amazing state of affairs. The Israelites are sending their wives to pray in the synagogues, and most workmen have ceased work. Debtors refuse to pay their debts, so that trade is almost paralysed." —**καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια.** Plato uses a similar expression in his *Republic*, 496 D (**ἡσυχίαν ἔχων καὶ τὰ αὑτοῦ πράττων**); but of the philosopher who withdraws in despair from the lawlessness of a world which he is impotent to help (see also Thompson's note on *Gorg.*, 526*c*).

Vv. 13-18. **περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων.**

Ver. 13. **δὲ**, after **οὐ θέλομεν** as a single expression.—Affection for the living has another side, *viz.*, unselfish solicitude for the dead. Since Paul left, some of the Thessalonian Christians had died, and the survivors were distressed by the fear that these would have to occupy a position secondary to those who lived until the advent of the Lord, or even that they had passed beyond any such participation at all. At Corinth some of the local Christians felt this anguish so keenly, on behalf of friends and relatives who had died outside the church, that they were in the habit of being baptised as their representatives, to ensure their final bliss (1 Cor. xv. 29). The concern of the Thessalonians, however, was for their fellow-Christians, in the intermediate state of Hades. As the problem had not arisen during Paul's stay at Thessalonica, he now offers the church a reasonable solution of the difficulty (13-18).—**οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν**, contrast the **οἴδατε** of iv. 2, v. 2, and compare the ordinary epistolary phrases of the papyri (*Expos.*, 1908. 55) such as **γεινώσκειν σε θέλω** (commonly at the beginning of a letter, *cf.* Col. ii. 1; Phil. i. 12; 2 Cor. i. 8, and with **ὅτι**, but here, as in 1 Cor. xii. 1, with **περί**).—**τῶν κοιμωμένων** = *the dead in Christ* (16), a favourite Jewish euphemism (Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conc. of Last Things*, 247 f., and *cf.* Fries in *Zeitschrift für neutest. Wiss.* i. 306 f.), not unknown to Greek and Roman literature.—**οἱ λοιποὶ, κ.τ.λ.,** *cf.* Butcher's *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*, pp. 153 f., 159 f. Hope is the distinguishing note of Christians here as in Eph. ii. 12; Col. i. 22, etc.

Ver. 14. Unlike some of the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv. 17, 18), the Thessalonians did not doubt the fact of Christ's resurrection (**εἰ** of course implies no uncertainty). Paul assumes their faith in it and argues from it. Their vivid and naïve belief in Christ's advent within their own lifetime was the very source of their distress. Paul still shares that belief (17).—**διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ** is an unusual expression which might, so far as grammar is concerned, go either with **τ. κ.** (so. *e.g.*, Ellic., Alford, Kabisch, Lightfoot, Findlay, Milligan) or **ἄξει.** The latter is the preferable construction (so most editors). The phrase is not needed (*cf.* 15) to limit **τ. κ.** to Christians (so Chrys., Calvin), for the unbelieving dead are not before the writer's mind, and, even so, **ἐν** would have been the natural preposition (*cf.* 16); nor does it mean martyrdom. In the light of v. 9 (*cf.* Rom. v. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 21), it seems to connect less awkwardly with **ἄξει**, though not = "at the intercession of Jesus"

[q] τοὺς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [r] ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ. 15. τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν λέγομεν [s] ἐν λόγῳ [s] Κυρίου, ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ [t] περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Κυρίου [u] οὐ μὴ [v] φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμη-

q = "those who have fallen asleep" (Moult. i. 162).

r *Cf.* Heb. i. 6 and Asc. Isa. iv. 16.

s LXX of 1 Kings xx. 35, "Domini nomine et quasi eo loquente" (Beza).

t 2 Macc. i. 31, viii. 14, etc.

u "by no means" (*cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 13).

v Sap. vi. 13, etc.

(Rutherford). Jesus is God's agent in the final act, commissioned to raise and muster the dead (*cf.* Stähelin, *Jahrb. f. deut. Theol.*, 1874, 189 f., and Schettler, *Die paul. Formel "Durch Christus,"* 1907, 57 f.). The divine mission of the Christ, which is to form the climax of things, involves the resurrection of the dead who are His (v. 10). Any general resurrection is out of the question (so Did., xvi. 6: **ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν· οὐ πάντων δὲ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐρρέθη, ἥξει ὁ Κύριος καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ**).

Ver. 15. **κυρίου.** On the tendency of the N.T. writers to reserve **κύριος**, with its O.T. predicates of divine authority, for Jesus, *cf.* Kattenbusch, *op. cit.*, ii. 522. Paul's use of the term goes back to Christ's own claim to **κύριος** in the higher sense of Mark xii. 35 f.—**λέγομεν.** Contrast the **οἴδατε** of v. 2 and the language of iv. 1. Evidently Paul had not had time or occasion to speak of such a contingency, when he was with them.—**ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου** may mean either (*a*) a quotation (like Acts xx. 35) from the sayings of Jesus, or (*b*) a prophetic revelation vouchsafed to Paul himself, or to Silvanus (*cf.* Acts xv. 32). In the former case (so, among modern editors, Schott, Ewald, Drummond, Wohl.), an **ἄγραφον** is cited (Calvin, Koch, Weizsäcker, Resch, *Paulinismus*, 238 f.; Ropes, *die Sprüche Jesu*, 153 f.; M. Goguel; van der Vies, 15-17; O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, 10; von Soden) but it is evidently given in a free form, and the precise words cannot (even in ver. 16) be disentangled. Besides we should expect **τινι** to be added. Unless, therefore, we are to think of a primitive collection (Lake, *Amer. Journ. Theol.*, 1906, 108 f.) or of some oral tradition, (*b*) is preferable. The contents of Matt. xxiv. 31 (part of the small apocalypse) are too dissimilar to favour the conjecture (Pelt, Zimmer, Weiss) that Paul was thinking of this saying as current perhaps in oral tradition, and the O.T. analogy of **λόγος Κυρίου** (= God's prophetic word), together with the internal probabilities of the case (Paul does not remind them of it, as elsewhere in the epistle) make it on the whole more likely that Paul is repeating words heard in a vision (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 9; so Chryst., Theod., etc., followed by Alford, de Wette, Ellicott, Dods, Lünemann, Godet, Paret: *Paulus und Jesus*, 53 f., Simon: *die Psychologie des Ap. Paulus*, 100, Findlay, Lightfoot, Milligan, Lueken). *Cf.* the discussion in Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles*, 408 f., and Feine's *Jesus Christus u. Paulus*, 178, 179. Later in the century a similar difficulty vexed the pious Jew who wrote Fourth Esdras (v. 41, 42: *I said, But lo, O Lord, thou hast made the promise to those who shall be in the end: and what shall they do that have been before us . . . ? And He said to me, I will liken my judgment to a ring; as there is no slackness of those who are last, so shall there be no swiftness of those who are first*). His theory is that the previous generations of Israel will be as well off as their posterity in the latter days. Further on (xiii. 14 f.) he raises and answers the question whether it was better to die before the last days or to live until they came (the phrase, *those that are left*, "qui relicti sunt," vii. 28 = Paul's **οἱ περιλειπόμενοι**). His solution (which Steck, in *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.*, 1883, 509-524, oddly regards as the **λόγος κ.** of 1 Thess. iv. 15; see Schmidt's refutation, pp. 107-110) is the opposite of Paul's: *those who are left are more blessed than those who have died.* If this difficulty was felt in Jewish circles during the first half of the century, it may have affected those of the Thessalonian Christians who had been formerly connected with the synagogue, but the likelihood is that Paul's language is coloured by his own Jewish training (*cf.* Charles on *Asc. Isa.*, iv. 15). The misunderstanding of the Thessalonians, which had led to their sorrow and perplexity, was evidently due to the fact that, for some reason or another, Paul had not mentioned the possibility of any Christians dying before the second advent (so sure was he that all would soon survive it), coupled with the fact that Greeks found it hard to grasp what exactly resurrection meant (*cf.* Acts xvii. 32) for Christians.

θέντας· 16. ὅτι [w]αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἐν κελεύσματι, ἐν φωνῇ [x]ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν [y]σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ, καταβήσεται ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, καὶ [z]οἱ νεκροὶ [a]ἐν [z]Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον· 17. [b]ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, [c]ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς [d]ἁρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν [e]τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα, καὶ οὕτω πάντοτε σὺν Κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα. 18. [f]ὥστε [g]παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους [h]ἐν τοῖς λόγοις [i]τούτοις.

w *Cf.* iii. 11; not angels as in Mt. xxiv. 31.
x Jude 9: to summon the angels? (iii. 13).
y 1 Cor. xv. 52, from Joel ii. 1 (LXX); *cf.* 4 Esd. vi. 23, etc.
z 1 Cor. xv. 15.
a Blass, § 47, 7.
b 1 Cor. xv. 7, 23.
c v. 10, II. i. 7; 2 Cor. iv. 14.
d Post-classical form, Win. § 13, 10
e Genitive as in Mt. xxv. 1.
f Burton, M.T. 237.
g v. 11., ii. 11.
h Instrumental, as 1 Cor. iv. 21, etc.
i *i.e.* 15-17.

Ver. 16. **κελεύσματι** = the loud summons which was to muster the saints (so in Philo, *De praem. et poen.*, 19: **καθάπερ οὖν ἀνθρώπους ἐν ἐσχατιαῖς ἀπῳκισμένους ῥᾳδίως ἑνὶ κελεύσματι συναγάγοι ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ περάτων εἰς ὅ τι ἂν θελήσῃ χωρίον**), forms, as its lack of any genitive shows, one conception with the **φ. α.** and the **σ. θ.** (*cf. DCG*, ii. 766). The archangel is Michael, who in Jewish tradition not only summoned the angels but sounded a trumpet to herald God's approach for judgment (*e.g.*, in *Apoc. Mosis*, xxii.). With such scenic and realistic details, drawn from the heterogeneous eschatology of the later Judaism, Paul seeks to make intelligible to his own mind and to that of his readers, in quite an original fashion (*cf.* Stähelin, *Jahrb. f. deut. Theol.*, 1874, pp. 199-218), the profound truth that neither death nor any cosmic crisis in the future will make any essential difference to the close relation between the Christian and his Lord. **Οὕτω πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα** (*cf.* v. 11; 2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 20): this is all that remains to us, in our truer view of the universe, from the naïve **λόγος κυρίου** of the apostle, but it is everything. Note that Paul says nothing here about any change of the body (Teichmann, 35 f.), or about the embodiment of the risen life in its celestial **δόξα**. See *Asc. Isa.*, iv. 14-15: "And the Lord will come with His holy angels and with the armies of the holy ones from the seventh heaven . . . and He will give rest to the godly whom He shall find in the body in this world."

Ver. 17. **ἐν νεφέλαις**, the ordinary method of sudden rapture or ascension to heaven (Acts i. 9, 11; Rev. xi. 12; Slav. En. iii. 1, 2).—**ἁρπαγησόμεθα.** So in Sap. iv. 11, the righteous man, **εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ** (1 Thess. iv. 1) **γενόμενος ἠγαπήθη** (1 Thess. i. 4), is caught up (**ἡρπάγη**).—**ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς . . . σὺν Κυρίῳ**, the future bliss is a re-union of Christians not only with Christ but with one another.—**εἰς ἀπάντησιν**, a pre-Christian phrase of the *koinê* (*cf. e.g.*, *Tebtunis Papyri*, 1902, pt. i., n. 43, 7, **παρεγενήθημεν εἰς ἀπάντησιν, κ.τ.λ.**, and Moulton, i. 14), implying welcome of a great person on his arrival. What further functions are assigned to the saints, thus incorporated in the retinue of the Lord (iii. 13; *cf.* 2 Thess. i. 10),—whether, *e.g.*, they are to sit as assessors at the judgment (Sap. iii. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; Luke xxii. 30)—Paul does not stop to state here. His aim is to reassure the Thessalonians about the prospects of their dead in relation to the Lord, not to give any complete programme of the future (so Matt. xxiv. 31; Did. x., xvi.). Plainly, however, the saints do not rise at once to heaven, but return with the Lord to the scene of his final manifestation on earth (so Chrysost., Aug., etc.). They simply *meet* the Lord in the air, on his way to judgment—a trait for which no Jewish parallel can be found.—**καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα** (no more sleeping in him or waiting for him).

Ver. 18. **ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις.** Paul had an intelligible word upon the future, unlike the Hellenic mysteries which usually made religion a matter of feeling rather than of definite teaching (Hardie's *Lect. on Classical Subjects*, pp. 53 f.). A pagan letter of consolation has been preserved from the second century (*Oxyrh. Papyri*, i. 115): "Eirene to Taonnophris and Philon good cheer! I was as grieved and wept as much over Eumoiros as over Didymas, and I did all that was fitting, as did all my family. . . . But still we can do nothing in such a case. So comfort yourselves. Goodbye." One of Cicero's pathetic letters (*ad. Fam.*, xiv. 2), written from Thessalonica, speaks doubtfully of any re-union after death ("haec non sunt in manu nostra").

V. 1. Περὶ δὲ τῶν [a] χρόνων καὶ τῶν [a] καιρῶν, ἀδελφοί, οὐ [b] χρείαν ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι· 2. [b] αὐτοὶ γὰρ [c] ἀκριβῶς οἴδατε ὅτι [d] ἡμέρα Κυρίου [e] ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται· 3. [f] ὅταν [1] λέγωσιν, "[g] Εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια," [f] τότε [h] αἰφνίδιος αὐτοῖς [i] ἐπίσταται [k] ὄλεθρος [l] ὥσπερ ἡ [m] ὠδὶν τῇ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσῃ, καὶ [n] οὐ μὴ ἐκφύγωσιν. 4. ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν [o] σκότει [p] ἵνα ἡ ἡμέρα [q] ὑμᾶς ὡς κλέπτας [2] καταλάβῃ· 5. [r] πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ

a See on Acts i. 7. b *Cf.* iv. 9. c *Cf.* on Acts xviii. 25. d Without article as in Phil. i. 6, 10, ii. 16. e Reminiscence of saying in Lk. xii. 39; *cf.* Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15. f *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 54. g Ezek. xiii. 10. h Lk. xxi. 34. i Win. § 5, 10, c.; Sap. vi. 5. k "Destruction" (II. i. 9). l *Cf.* En. lxii. 4. m On form, *cf.* Win. § 9, 10. n iv. 15; *cf.* Ps. Sol. xv. 9, and above on iv. 8. o Rom. ii. 19; *cf.* Hom. *Iliad*, iii. 10, κλέπτῃ δέ τε νυκτὸς ἀμείνω. p Conceived result (*cf.* Burton, M.T., 218-219) = "so that". q Emphatic. r From Lk. xvi. 8 (*cf.* En. cviii. 11)?

[1] To the original asyndeton of **οταν** (א*AG, 17, 44, 47, 179, d, e, f, g, Syr.sch, arm., aeth., Tert., Cyp., Jer, Orig., etc.; so edd.), either **γαρ** (KLP, vg. Euthal., Dam.), or **δε** (א[c]BD, cop., Syr.P, Eus., Chrys., Theod., Schott, Findlay, WH marg.) has been subsequently added. For **ωσπερ η ωδιν**, Bentl. conj. **ωσπερει ωδινες.**

[2] **κλεπτας** (AB cop., so Bentl., Grot., Koch, Ewald, Renan, Jowett, Rutherford, Lach., WH, Lgft.), seems to be smoothed away in the strongly attested variant and correction **κλεπτης** (from ver. 2). Field (200-201) cites instances from Plutarch (*e.g.*, *Vit. Crassi*, xxix., **τον δε Κρασσον ημερα κατελαβεν**) and Pausanias, to illustrate nocturnal operations being surprised by the advent of the dawn. "The echo of the word (**κλεπτης**) is still in his ears; to avoid repetition, he changes its use. Lastly, the reading **κλεπτας** gives a point to **υιοι φωτος**" (Jowett). For another instance of AB preserving the original reading, *cf.* Eph. i. 20.

CHAPTER V.—Vv. 1-11. **περὶ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν.**

Ver. 1. The *times and periods* are not "simply the broad course of time, of which the **ἡμέρα Κυρίου** constitutes the closing scene" (Baur); **καιρός** denotes a section of time more definitely than **χρόνος**, in Greek usage. "No nation has distinguished so subtly the different forms under which time can be logically conceived. **Χρόνος** is time viewed in its extension, as a succession of moments, the external framework of action. . . . **Καιρός**, a word, which has, I believe, no single or precise eqivalent in any other language . . . is that immediate present which is what we make it; time charged with opportunity" (Butcher, *Harvard Lect. on Gk. Subjects*, pp. 117-119). In the plural, especially in this eschatological outlook, the phrase is little more, however, than a periphrasis for "when exactly things are to happen". Paul thought he needed to do no more than reiterate the suddenness of the Last Day. But, not long afterwards, he found that the Thessalonians did require to have the **χρόνοι καὶ καιροί** explained to them in outline (II., ii. 2 f.).

Ver. 2. **οἴδατε**, referring to the teaching of Jesus on this crucial point, which Paul had transmitted to them (see Introduction).

Ver. 3. **ὅταν, κ.τ.λ.**, when the very words, "All's well," "It is all right," are on their lips.—**ἐπίσταται**, of an enemy suddenly appearing (Isocrat., *Evag.*, § 58 **ἐπὶ τὸ βασίλειον ἐπιστάς**, Herod. iv. 203).—**αὐτοῖς**, *i.e.*, while the Day comes suddenly to Christians and unbelievers alike, only the latter are surprised by it. Christians are on the alert, open-eyed; they do not know when it is to come, but they are alive to any signs of its coming. Thus there is no incompatibility between this emphasis on the instantaneous character of the advent and the emphasis, in II., ii. 3 f., on the preliminary conditions.

Ver. 4. From the sudden and unexpected nature of the Last Day, Paul passes, by a characteristic inversion of metaphor in **κλέπτας**, to a play of thought upon the day as light. A double symbolism of **ἡμέρα**, as of **κοιμᾶσθαι**, thus pervades 4-8. Lightfoot cites a very striking parallel from Eur., *Iph. Taur.*, 1025-1026.

Ver. 5. The present age is utter night (שֶׁכֻּלּוֹ לַיְלָה), as contemporary rabbis taught; the age to come is all day. Meantime faith is to be held fast through this night (*cf.* passages quoted in Schlatter's *die Sprache u. Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*, 17, 18). **υἱοὶ φ. καὶ υ.**

ἡμέρας· οὐκ ἐσμὲν νυκτὸς [s] οὐδὲ σκότους. 6 Ἄρα [t] οὖν μὴ [u] καθεύδωμεν ὡς οἱ [v] λοιποὶ ἀλλὰ [w] γρηγορῶμεν καὶ [x] νήφωμεν. 7. οἱ γὰρ καθεύδοντες νυκτὸς καθεύδουσι· καὶ οἱ [y] μεθυσκόμενοι νυκτὸς μεθύουσιν· 8. [z] ἡμεῖς δὲ [a] ἡμέρας ὄντες νήφωμεν, [b] ἐνδυσάμενοι [c] θώρακα πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας· 9. ὅτι οὐκ [d] ἔθετο [e] ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς [f] ὀργήν ἀλλ' εἰς [g] περιποίησιν σωτηρίας διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 10. τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα [h] εἴτε γρηγορῶμεν, εἴτε καθεύδωμεν, [i] ἅμα σὺν αὐτῷ ζήσωμεν. 11. διὸ [k] παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε [l] εἷς τὸν ἕνα, καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖτε.

s ii. 3, 11 f.
t *Cf.* II. ii. 15; *cf.* 1 Rom. v. 18, etc.
u *Cf.* on Eph. v. 14.
v iv. 13.
w *Cf.* on 1 Cor. xvi. 13; Mt. xxiv. 42.
x See on 1 Pet. v. 8.
y Win. § 15.
z Eph. vi. 14, 17; Rom. xiii. 11 f.
a Constr.; *cf.* Win. § 30, 11, b.
b Isa. lix. 17.
c *Cf.* on Eph. vi. 14="coat of mail".
d 1 Pet. ii. 8.
e Emphatic, as opposed to οἱ λοιποί.
f i. 10.
g *Cf.* on Eph. i. 14; here active (= possess.) as in II. ii. 14. Heb. x. 39.
h *Cf.* for syntax, Rom. xiv. 8; Burton, M.T., 252-253.
i iv. 17.
k iv. 18.
l unclassical, Blass, § 45, 2; *cf.* 1 Cor. v. 6.

ἡμέρας is a stronger and Semitic way of expressing the thought of "belonging to" (*cf.* ver. 8).

Ver. 6. To be alert, in one's sober senses (**νήφειν**), is more than to be merely awake. Here, as in verse 8, the Christians are summoned to live up to their privileges and position towards the Lord. "There are few of us who are not rather ashamed of our sins and follies as we look out on the blessed morning sunlight, which comes to us like a bright-winged angel beckoning us to quit the old path of vanity that stretches its dreary length behind us" (George Eliot). In one of the Zoroastrian scriptures (*Vendidad*, xviii. 23-25) the cock, as the bird of the dawn, is inspired to cry, "Arise, O men! . . . Lo here is Bushyasta coming down upon you, who lulls to sleep again the whole living world as soon as it has awoke, saying, 'Sleep, sleep on, O man [and live in sin, *Yasht*, xxii. 41]! The time is not yet come.'"

Ver. 7. *Cf.* Plutarch, *De Iside*, vi., **Οἶνον δὲ οἱ μὲν ἐν Ἥλιου πόλει θεραπεύοντες τὸν θεὸν οὐκ εἰσφέρουσιν τοπαράπαν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ὡς οὐ προσῆκον ἡμέρας πίνειν, τοῦ κυρίου καὶ βασιλέως ἐφορῶντος.**

Ver. 8. **ἐνδυσάμενοι θώρακα κ.τ.λ.**, the thought of ii. 12, 13; the mutual love of Christians, which forms the practical expression of their faith in God, is their true fitness and equipment for the second advent. Faith and love are a unity; where the one goes the other follows. They are also not merely their own coat of mail, requiring no extraneous protection, but the sole protection of life against indolence, indifference and indulgence. They need simply to be used. If they are not used, they are lost, and with them the Christian himself. The transition to the military metaphor is mediated (as in Rom. xiii. 12, 13) by the idea of the sentry's typical vigilance.

Ver. 9. The mention of the future **σωτηρία** starts Paul off, for a moment, on what it involves (9, 10).

Ver. 10. Life or death makes no difference to the Christian's union and fellowship with Jesus Christ, whose death was in our eternal interests (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 7-9). For this metaphorical use of **γρηγ. εἴτε καθ.** (different from that in 6), Wohl. cites Plato, *Symp.*, 203a: **διὰ τούτου** (i.e. Eros) **πᾶσα ἐστιν ἡ ὁμιλία καὶ ἡ διάλεκτος θεοῖς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἐγρηγορόσι καὶ καθεύδουσιν,** as a possible basis.

Ver. 11. The modification in the primitive attitude of Christians to the Parousia of Jesus is significant. Instead of all expecting to be alive at that blessed crisis, the inroads of death had now forced men to the higher consolation that "it did not make the least difference whether one became partaker of the blessings of that event in the ranks of the dead or of the living. The question whether the Parousia was to happen sooner or later was no longer of paramount importance. The important thing was to cultivate that attitude of mind which the writer of this epistle recommended" (Baur).—**οἰκοδομεῖτε**, the term sums up all the support and guidance that a Christian receives from the fellowship of the church (*cf.* Beyschlag's *N.T. Theology*, ii. 232). —**καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖτε**, another instance (*cf.* iv. 1, 10) of Paul's fine courtesy and tact. He is careful to recognise the Thessalonians' attainments,

12. [m] Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, [n] εἰδέναι τοὺς [o] κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ [p] προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν ἐν Κυρίῳ καὶ [q] νουθετοῦντας ὑμᾶς, 13. καὶ [r] ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπερεκπερισσῶς ἐν ἀγάπῃ διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν. [s] εἰρηνεύετε ἐν [t] ἑαυτοῖς. 14. [u] παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, νουθετεῖτε τοὺς [v] ἀτάκτους, [w] παραμυθεῖσθε τοὺς [x] ὀλιγοψύχους, ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἀσθενῶν, [y] μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας. 15. ὁρᾶτε [z] μή τις [a] κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ τινὶ ἀποδῷ· ἀλλὰ πάντοτε τὸ [b] ἀγαθὸν διώκετε εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας. 16. πάντοτε [c] χαίρετε, 17. [d] ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε, 18. ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖτε· τοῦτο γὰρ θέλημα θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς. 19. τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε, 20. προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε, 21. πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε, 22. ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε.

m iv. 1, II. ii. 2. *Cf.* Ps. cxliv. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 18; Ign. *Smyrn.* ix. n Gal. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 10. o *Cf.* on Rom. xii. 8. p See on Acts xx. 31; 1 Cor. iv. 14. q Phil. ii. 3; *cf.* Thuc. iv. 5, etc. r Mk. ix. 50; 2 Cor. xiii. 11. s = ἀλλήλοις. (so Plato, *Gorg.* 465 c). t *Cf.* ii. 11. u Xen. *Mem.* III. i. 7. v ii. 11; Joh. xi. 19. 31. w Exod. vi. 9; Isa. lvii. 15; Sir. vii. 10, and Ps. Sol. xvi. 11. x See on 1 Cor. xiii. 4. y Object. clause (Burton, M.T. 209). z Prov. xx. 22 (Matt. v. 44); Rom. xii. 17. a = "What is kind and helpful." b 1 Pet. iii. 9; *cf.* Phil. iv. 4; Rom. xii. 12, and Col. i. 11. c 1 Thess. i. 3; *cf.* Ign. *Eph.* x.; Herm. *Sim.* ix. 11, 7; Ep. Arist. 226 (τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦ διαπαντός).

even while stirring them up to further efforts.

Vv. 12-22. General instructions for the church.

Ver. 12. These **προϊστάμενοι** are not officials but simply local Christians like Jason, Secundus, and perhaps Demas (in whose houses the Christians met), who, on account of their capacities or position, had informally taken the lead and made themselves responsible for the welfare and worship of the new society. The organisation is quite primitive, and the triple description of these men's functions is too general to permit any precise delineation of their duties (*cf.* Lindsay's *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, pp. 122 f). **κοπιῶντας** denotes the energy and practical interest of these people, which is further defined by **προϊσταμένους** (a term with technical associations, to which **ἐν κυρίῳ** is added in order to show that their authority rests on religious services) and **νουθετοῦντας** (= the moral discipline, perhaps of catechists, teachers and prophets). An instinct of rebellion against authority is not confined to any one class, but artisans and tradesmen are notorious for a tendency to suspect or depreciate any control exercised over them in politics or in religion, especially when it is exercised by some who have risen from their own ranks. The community at Thessalonica was largely recruited from this class, and Paul, with characteristic penetration, appeals for respect and generous appreciation towards the local leaders.

Ver. 13. "Regard them with a very special love for their works' sake" (so thorough and important it is). "Be at peace among yourselves" (instead of introducing divisions and disorder by any insubordination or carping).

Ver. 14. The particular form of insubordination at Thessalonica was idleness (for the contemporary use of **ἀτ.** in this sense, see *Oxyrh. Papyri*, ii. 1901, p. 275). Similarly, in *Olynth.* iii. 11, Demosthenes denounces all efforts made to shield from punishment **τοὺς ἀτακτοῦντας**, *i.e.*, those citizens who shirk active service and evade the State's call for troops.—**ὀλιγοψύχους** = "faint-hearted" (under trial, i. 6, see references), **ἀντέχεσθε** (cleave to, put your arm round), **ἀσθενῶν** (*i.e.*, not in health only but in faith or position, Acts xx. 35), **μακ. π. πάντας** = do not lose temper or patience with any (of the foregoing classes) however unreasonable and exacting they may be (*cf.* Prov. xviii. 14, LXX). The mutual services of the community are evidently not to be left to the **προϊστάμενοι**, for Paul here urges on the rank and file the same kind of social duties as he implies were incumbent upon their leaders (*cf.* **νουθετ.** 12, 14). If **ἀδελφοί** here meant the **προϊστάμενοι**, it would have been more specificially defined. An antithesis between 12 and 14 would be credible in a speech, not in a letter.

Ver. 15. The special circumstances which called for forbearance (ver. 14) were likely to develop a disposition to retaliate upon those who displayed an ungenerous and insubordinate spirit (*e.g.*, the **ἄτακτοι**); but the injunction has a wider range (**εἰς πάντας**, including their fellow-countrymen, ii. 14).

Ver. 16. To comment adequately upon these diamond drops (16-18) would be to outline a history of the Christian experience in its higher levels. **π. χαίρετε**, *cf.* Epict., i. 16 ("Had we understanding, ought we to do anything but sing hymns and bless the Deity and tell of His benefits? . . . What else can I do, a lame

λείπτως προσεύχεσθε, 18. [e] ἐν παντὶ [f] εὐχαριστεῖτε· [g] τοῦτο γὰρ [g] θέλημα Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [h] εἰς ὑμᾶς. 19. τὸ πνεῦμα [i] μὴ [k] σβέννυτε, 20. προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε· 21. πάντα [l] δὲ [l] δοκιμάζετε, τὸ [m] καλὸν κατέχετε· 22. [n] ἀπὸ παντὸς [o] εἴδους πονηροῦ [p] ἀπέχεσθε. 23. [q] Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἁγιάσαι ὑμᾶς [r] ὁλοτελεῖς· καὶ

e *Cf.* on 2 Cor. iv. 8. f 2 Cor. vi. 10; Phil. iv. 6; Clem. Rom. xxx.-viii. 4. g iv. 3. h For absence of article in this constr. see Field, 59-60 on the similar usage in Lk. vii. 30. i "Give over": μὴ with pres. imper. implies action already begun Moult. i. 122 f. k Contrast 2 Tim. i. 5, and *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 1. l ii. 4; 1 Jo. iv. 1. m 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Phil. i. 10. n Like Job (Job i. 1, 8, ii. 3). o = "form" or "sort" (so Jos. *Ant.* x. 3). p iv. 3; *cf.* Did. iii. 1. q iii. 11, iv. 16. r Only here (N.T.), = ὅλους (through and through).

[1] After παντα edd. add the disjunctive δε (with almost all MSS. and vss., also Clem., Alex., *Paed.* iii. 12, 95, exc. ℵ*A, cop., syr.sch), which became absorbed by the first syllable of the following word. Blass (after K, min., etc.) **δοκιμαζοντες.**

old man, than sing hymns to God? . . . I exhort you to join in this same song.") There is a thread of connection with the foregoing counsel. The unswerving aim of being good and doing good to all men, is bound up with that faith in God's unfailing goodness to men which enables the Christian cheerfully to accept the disappointments and sufferings of social life. This faith can only be held by prayer, *i.e.*, a constant reference of all life's course to God, and such prayer must be more than mere resignation; it implies a spirit of unfailing gratitude to God, instead of any suspicious or rebellious attitude.

Ver. 17. "*Pray always*, says the Apostle; that is, have the habit of prayer, turning your thoughts into acts by connecting them with the idea of the redeeming God" (Coleridge, *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*), cp. iii. 11, v. 23.

Ver. 18. Chrysostom, who wrote: **τὸ ἀεὶ δηλονότι εὐχαριστεῖν, τοῦτο φιλοσόφου ψυχῆς,** gave a practical illustration of this heroic temper by repeating, as he died in the extreme hardships of an enforced and painful exile, **δόξα τῷ θεῷ πάντων ἕνεκα.** For thanksgiving even in bereavement, *cf.* Aug., *Conf.*, ix. 12; and further, *ibid.*, ix. 7 (tunc hymni et psalmi ut canerentur, secundum morem Orientalium partium, ne populus maeroris taedio contabesceret, institutum est).

Ver. 19. **τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.** The primary reference is to **εὐχαριστεῖτε,** but the preceding imperatives are so closely bound up with this, that it is needless to exclude them from the scope of the **θέλημα.—ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** This glad acceptance of life's rain and sunshine alike as from the hand of God, Jesus not only exemplified (*cf.* context of **μιμηταὶ . . . τοῦ Κυρίου,** i. 6) but also enabled all who keep in touch with him to realise. The basis of it is the Christian revelation and experience; apart from the living Lord it is neither conceivable nor practicable (*cf.* R. H. Hutton's *Modern Guides of English Thought*, pp. 122 f.).

Ver. 20. As **εὐχαριστεῖν** was a special function of the prophets in early Christian worship (*cf.* Did. x. 7), the transition is natural. The local abuses of ecstatic prophecy in prediction (2 Thess. ii. 2) or what seem to be exaggerated counsels of perfection (ver. 16 f.) must not be allowed to provoke any reaction which would depreciate and extinguish this vital gift or function of the faith. Paul, with characteristic sanity, holds the balance even. Such enthusiastic outbursts are neither to be despised as silly vapouring nor to be accepted blindly as infallible revelations. The true criticism of **προφητεία** comes (ver. 21) from the Christian conscience which is sensitive to the **καλόν,** the **συμφέρον,** the **οἰκοδομή,** or the **ἀναλογία τῆς πίστεως** (*cf.* Weizsäcker's *Apost. Age*, ii. 270 f.). But this criticism must be positive. In applying the standard of spiritual discernment, it must sift, not for the mere pleasure of rejecting the erroneous but with the object of retaining what is genuine.

Ver. 22. A further general precept, added to bring out the negative side of **κατέχετε, κ.τ.λ.—πονηροῦ** neut. abstract = "of wickedness," as Gen. ii. 9 (**τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ**).—**παντὸς κ.τ.λ.**, perhaps an allusion to the manifold ways of going wrong (Arist., *Nik. Eth.*, ii. 6 14, **τὸ μὲν ἁμαρτάνειν πολλαχῶς ἐστίν . . . τὸ δὲ κατορθοῦν μοναχῶς**).

Ver. 23. **εἰρήνης,** with a special allusion to the breaches of harmony and charity produced by vice (*cf.* connection of iii. 12, 13 and iv. 3 f.), indolence, impatience of authority or of defects in one

[s] ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ [t] σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθείη. 24. [u] πιστὸς ὁ [v] καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὃς καὶ [w] ποιήσει.

25. Ἀδελφοί, [x] προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν. 26. ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς πάντας ἐν [y] φιλήματι [z] ἁγίῳ.

27. ἐνορκίζω [1] ὑμᾶς [a] τὸν Κύριον, [b] ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν [c] ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.

28. ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν.

s Adj. put first for emphasis, agreeing with first of subst. which it precedes.
t *Cf.* Phil. iii. 21.
u See above on iii. 13, and ii. 10.
v See on 1 Cor. i. 9.
w As Num. xxiii. 19; Ps. xxxvii. 5 (LXX). 1 Cor. xvi. 20; and Justin's Apol. i. 65.
x Ver. 17, II. iii. 1.
y See on Rom. xvi. 16; Acts xix. 13.
z Clem. Alex. *Paed.* III. ii. 81.
a For constr. *cf.* b Lk. iv. 16; Acts xv. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 15; Col. iv. 16.
c II. ii. 15.

[1] Read **ενορκιζω** [only here N.T., = "adjure," strengthened form of **ορκιζω**] with ABD*, min., Euth., Dam. (edd.). But om. **αγιοις** before **αδελφοις** with א*BDG, min., d, e, f, g, aeth., Euth., Amb., Cassiod. (edd., exc. de Wette, Koch, Ellic., Weiss); the addition of **αγιοις**, like the omission of **πασι**, "entspringt vielleicht dem hierarchischen Interesse, die Bibel nicht Allen zugänglich zu machen" (Zimmer).

another (v. 13 f.), retaliation (v. 15), and differences of opinion (v. 19 f.) Such faults affect the **σῶμα**, the **ψυχή** and the **πνεῦμα** respectively, as the sphere of that pure and holy consciousness whose outcome is **εἰρήνη**.—**ὑμῶν**, unemphatic genitive (as in iii. 10, 13, *cf.* Abbott's *Johannine Grammar*, 2559*a*) throwing the emphasis on the following word or words. **πνεῦμα** is put first, as the element in human nature which Paul held to be most directly allied to God, while **ψυχή** denotes as usual the individual life. The collocation of these terms is unusual but of course quite untechnical.—**ἀμέμπτως** has almost a proleptic tinge = "preserved entire, (so as to be) blameless at the arrival of," which has led to the substitution, in some inferior MSS., of **εὑρεθείη** for **τηρηθείη** (*cf.* textual discussion in *Amer. Jour. Theol.*, 1903, 453 f.). The construction is rather awkward, but the general sense is clear. With the thought of the whole verse compare Ps. Sol. xviii. 6: **καθαρίσαι ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ . . . εἰς ἡμέραν ἐκλογῆς ἐν ἀνάξει Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ**, also the description of Abraham being preserved by the divine **σοφία** in Sap. x. 5 (**ἐτήρησεν αὐτὸν ἄμεμπτον θεῷ**).

Ver. 24. The call implies that God will faithfully carry out the process of **ἁγιάζεσθαι** and **τηρεῖσθαι** (*cf.* Phil. i. 6), which is the divine side of the human endeavour outlined in the preceding verse.

Vv. 25-27. Closing words of counsel and prayer.

Ver. 26. Neither here, nor above at ver. 14, is there any reason to suppose that Paul turns to address the leaders of the local church (so *e.g.*, Bornemann, Ellicott, Alford, Askwith, Zimmer, Lightfoot, Weiss, Findlay) as though they were, in the name of the apostle(s), to convey the holy (*i.e.* not of convention or human passion) kiss, which betokened mutual affection (*cf.* Renan's *S. Paul*, 262, *DCG.* i. 935, and *E. Bi.* 4254) in the early Christian worship. This greeting by proxy is not so natural as the ordinary sense of the words; the substitution of **τ. ἀ. π.** for the more common **ἀλλήλους** is intelligible in the light, *e.g.*, *cf.* Phil. iv. 21; and it would be harsh to postulate so sharp a transition from the general reference of v. 25 and v. 28. Even in ver. 27 it is not necessary to think of the local leaders. While the epistle would naturally be handed to some of them in the first instance, it was addressed to the church; the church owned it and was held responsible for its public reading at the weekly worship.—**πᾶσιν**, like the **πάντας** of ver. 26, simply shows Paul's desire to prevent the church from becoming, on any pretext, a clique or coterie. But the remarkable emphasis of the injunction points to a period when such public reading of an apostolic epistle was not yet a recognised feature in the worship of the churches. Paul lays stress upon the proper use of his epistle, as being meant not for a special set, but for the entire brotherhood (*i.e.*, at Thessalonica, not, as Flatt thinks, in Macedonia). See that every member gets a hearing of it at some meeting or other (**ἀναγ.**, timeless aor.), and thus knows exactly what has been said. So *Apoc. Bar.* lxxxvi.: "when therefore ye receive this my epistle, read it in your congregations with care. And meditate thereon, above all on the days of your fasts."

ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Β̄.

I. 1. [a] ΠΑΥΛΟΣ καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλο-
νικέων ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ· 2. χάρις ὑμῖν
καὶ [a] εἰρήνη [b] ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς [1] καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ [b] Χριστοῦ.
3. [c] εὐχαριστεῖν [c] ὀφείλομεν τῷ Θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί,
(καθὼς [d] ἄξιόν ἐστιν) ὅτι [e] ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ [f] πλεονάζει
ἡ [g] ἀγάπη ἑνὸς ἑκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους· 4. ὥστε αὐτοὺς
[h] ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑμῖν [i] ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς [k] ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑπὲρ
τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ

a *Cf.* I. i. 1.
b *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 3, etc.
c ii. 13; Clem. Rom. xxxviii.
4. *Cf.* 1 John iii. 16, iv. 11.
d See on 1 Cor. xvi. 4 and Phil. i. 7.
e Only here in N.T.
f 2 Pet. i. 8.
g In answer to prayer of I. iii. 12, iv. 9-10.
h As well as others (I. i. 8); ὥστε with inf. as in I. i. 7.
i See 2 Cor. ix. 2.
k *i.e.* of Achaia, etc. *Cf.* I. i. 3.

[1] Om. ημων after πατρος with BDP, 17, 49, 71, d, e, Theoph., Pelag. (Al., Lachm., WH, Findlay, Milligan, etc.), as a scribal addition from ver. 1.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-8. The address (i. 1, 2) is followed first by a thanksgiving (3-10) which passes into a prophetic piece of consolation, and then by a brief prayer (11, 12).

Ver. 3. **περὶ ὑμῶν**: Your thankless situation (4 f.) only throws into more brilliant relief your personal character and bearing under adverse circumstances. **ὅτι** is best represented by our colloquial "because," which includes both the causal and the objective senses of the word; what forms matter for thanksgiving is naturally the reason for thanksgiving. **ἀγάπη κ.τ.λ.**, a period of strain tires mutual gentleness (see on Rev. ii. 4) as well as patience towards God (ver. 4), since irritation and lack of unselfish consideration for others (*cf.* iii. 6 f.) may be as readily produced by a time of tension and severe anxiety as an impatient temper of faith. Paul is glad and grateful that suffering was drawing his friends together and binding them more closely to their Lord, instead of stunting the growth of their faith and drying up the flow of their mutual charity. Praise comes as usual before blame. Paul is proud of his friends, because suffering has not spoiled their characters, as suffering, especially when due to oppression and injustice, is too apt to do.—**ὀφείλομεν** (so Cic. *ad. Fam.*, xiv. 2, gratiasque egi, ut debui; Barn. v. 3, vii. 1), the phrase is unexampled in Paul, but not unnatural (*cf.* Rom. xv. 1, etc.); "the form of duty is one which all thoughts naturally take in his mind" (Jowett).

Ver. 4. The single article groups **ὑπομονὴ** and **πίστις** as a single conception = faith in its special aspect of patient endurance (*cf.* on Rev. xiii. 10), faithful tenacity of purpose. M. Gebhardt, in his *L'Italie Mystique* (pp. 318 f.), observes that "the final word of Dante's belief, of that 'religion of the heart' which he mentions in the *Convito*, is given in the 24th canto of the *Paradiso*. He comes back to the very simple symbol of Paul, faith, hope and love; for him as for the apostle faith is at bottom simply hope." Faith is more than that to Paul, but sometimes hardly more. The Thessalonians are not to fear that they are holding a forlorn outpost. Neither man nor God overlooks their courage (*cf.* Plato's *Theaet.*, xxv., **ἀνδρικῶς ὑπομεῖναι καὶ μὴ ἀνάνδρως φεύγειν**). Their founders and friends at a distance are watching with pride their resolute faith; while in God's

ταῖς θλίψεσιν [l] αἷς ἀνέχεσθε, 5. [m] ἔνδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, [n] εἰς τὸ [o] καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε· 6. [p] εἴπερ [q] δίκαιον παρὰ Θεῷ [r] ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλῖψιν 7. καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις [s] ἄνεσιν [t] μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ [u] ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ 8. [v] ἐν πυρὶ φλογός, διδόντος [w] ἐκδίκησιν [x] τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι Θεὸν καὶ τοῖς μὴ [y] ὑπακούουσι τῷ [y] εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Κυρίου [n] *Cf.* I. ii. 12.

l Attract. fr ἅς or ὅν (Win. § 24, 4e).
m Only here in N.T.; for idea, see Phil. i. 27-28 and Sap. iii. 3 f.
o See on Acts v. 41 and xiv. 22.
p See on Rom. iii. 30, viii. 9, 17 = "since".
q Exod. xxiii. 22; see on Rom. ii. 5 6, 9, viii. 17; 2 Cor. iv. 17 f.
r From Isa. lxvi. 2 (LXX).
s *Cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 13; Asc. Isa. iv. 15 (quoted on I. iv. 16).
t 1 Thess. ii. 15; see below, iii. 2. "We need it too, God knows!"
u 1 Cor. i. 7; Rom. ii. 5. and on 1 Cor. iii. 13. A Hebraism.
v *Cf.* LXX of Exod. iii. 2; Isa. xxix. 6, lxvi. 6, 15 f.
w Ezek. xxv. 14 (LXX); Jer. xxv. 12; Deut. vii. 9.
x *Cf.* I. iv. 5 (Jer. x. 25; Ps. lxxviii. 6).
y *Cf.* Rom. x. 16. Acts vi. 7; Clem. Rom. xlii. 4.

sure process of providence that faith has a destiny of its own, since it is bound up with His eternal designs. Hope is only mentioned once (ii. 16, *cf.* iii. 5) in this epistle, for all its preoccupation with the future. Faith covers almost all its contents here.—**θλίψεσιν** more general than **διωγμοῖς**.—**ὑπὲρ**, as in I., iii. 2, is equivalent to **περί**, with a touch of personal interest (Abbott's *Johannine Grammar*, p. 559; Meisterhans, *Gramm. d. attischen Inschriften*, 182).

Ver. 5. **ἔνδειγμα**, in apposition to the general thought of the preceding clause; it does not matter to the sense whether the word is taken as an elliptic nominative or an appositional accusative. "All this is really a clear proof of (or points to) the equity of God's judgment," which will right the present inequalities of life (Dante, *Purg.*, x. 109 f.). **Δικαία κρίσις** is the future and final judgment of 6-10, whose principle is recompense (Luke xvi. 25); there is a divine law of compensation which will operate. This throws back light upon the present sufferings of the righteous. These trials, it is assumed, are due to loyalty and innocence of life; hence, in their divine aspect (ver. 5), they are the necessary qualification or discipline for securing entrance into the realm of God. They are significant, not casual. Paul begins by arguing that their very infliction or permission proves that God must be contemplating a suitable reward and destiny for those who endured them in the right spirit. **εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ.**, is thus a loose expansion (from the common rabbinic phrase, *cf.* Dalman's *Worte Jesu*, 97 f.; E. Tr., 119) of one side of the **δικ. κρίσις**. The other side, the human aspect of **θλῖψις**, then emerges in ver. 6. Since the Thessalonians were suffering at the hands of men (**τοὺς θλίβοντας**, Isa. xix. 20), the two-handed engine of retribution (so Lam. iii. 64 f.; Obad. 15; Isa. lix. 18, for **ἀνταποδ.**) must in all fairness punish the persecutors (*cf.* Sap. xi. 9, 10). This is the only passage in which Paul welcomes God's vengeance on the enemies of the church as an element in the recompense of Christians.—**ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε**: to see an intelligible purpose in suffering, or to connect it with some larger movement and hope, is always a moral stay. "God gave three choice gifts to Israel—the Torah, the Land of Promise, and Eternal Life, and each was won by suffering" (*Berachoth*, 5*a*).

Ver. 7. After noting the principle of recompence (5-7*a*), Paul proceeds (7*b*-10) to dwell on its time and setting, especially in its punitive aspect. He consoles the Thessalonians by depicting the doom of their opponents rather than (9*c*, 10) their own positive relief and reward. The entire passage breathes the hot air of the later Judaism, with its apocalyptic anticipation of the *jus talionis* applied by God to the enemies of His people; only, Paul identifies that people not with Israel but with believers in Christ Jesus. He appropriates Israel's promises for men and women whom Israel expelled and persecuted.—The **ἄγγελοι** are the manifestation of Christ's **δύναμις**, as the **ἅγιοι** (saints not angels) are of his **δόξα** (ver. 10); the position of **ἀγγ.** (*cf.* Win., § 80, 12*b*) tells against Hofmann's interpretation of **δυν.** = "host" (צְבָא, so LXX). Here and in the following verses the divine prerogatives (*e.g.*, fiery manifestation and judicial authority) are carried over to Jesus.

Ver. 8. *Those who know not God* are of course not pagans as such but immoral pagans, in the sense of Rom. i. 28 f. *Those who refuse obedience to the*

z 4 Macc. x. 15. a From Isa. ii. 10, 19, 21 (LXX). b = fut. perf. (Moult. 186). c Only here in N.T., *cf.* Ex. xiv. 4; Sir. xxxviii. 6, etc.; Isa. iv. 2 f., xlix. 3. d Reminiscence of Ps. lxviii. 36; lxxxix. 8 (LXX). *Cf.* Sir. xxxviii. 3; 4 Macc. xviii. 3. e *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 6. f From Isa. ii. 11 (17). g *Cf.* Col. i. 29. "It is to this our thoughts turn as we pray, etc." (Rutherford). h Equivalent, as *e.g.* in LXX of Exod. ix. 16.

ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ· 9. οἵτινες δίκην τίσουσιν, [z] ὄλεθρον [z] αἰώνιον, [a] ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, 10. ὅταν [b] ἔλθῃ [c] ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ καὶ [d] θαυμασθῆναι ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύσασιν (ὅτι ἐπιστώθη [1] τὸ [e] μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς) [f] ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. 11. [g] εἰς ὃ καὶ προσευχόμεθα πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, [h] ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ τῆς κλήσεως ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ πληρώσῃ πᾶσαν

[1] For **επιστευθη** Markland and Hort conj. **επιστωθη** (so 31, 112), as if "the Christian testimony (vv. 4-5) of suffering for the faith had been confirmed and sealed upon the Thessalonians" (*cf.* Ps. xcii. 4 f, LXX, **θαυμαστος εν υψηλοις ο κυριος· τα μαρτυρια σου επιστωθησαν σφοδρα**). **πιστωθητω** is used (as here with **επι**) of the divine word in 1 Chron. xvii. 23 (*cf.* 2 Chron. ii. 9). The MSS. reading throws **επιστευθη** to the front for emphasis, but it must go with **εφ ημας**. The point of the sentence, as Lgft. admits, leads us to expect "a direct connexion between the Thessalonians and a *belief* in the gospel rather than between the Thess. and the *preaching* of the gospel," so that **μαρτυριον** is less vital to **εφ ημας**. No satisfactory parallel can be quoted for either construction of **επιστευθη**, however, and the likelihood upon the whole is that it represents a primitive and natural corruption of **επιστωθη**.

gospel are, as the repetition of the article suggests, a different class of people, perhaps drawn both from Jews and pagans. But as Paul never seems to contemplate the idea of any Jew failing to hear the gospel (*cf.* Rom. x. 16 f.), the description here applies principally to them.—**ἐν πυρὶ φλογός,** one of the most favourite realistic traits of the last judgment, in apocalyptic Judaism (*cf.* passages in Volz's *Jüdische Eschatologie*, 285, 286); here it is simply a descriptive touch, which Paul does not pause to elaborate (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 13). The rather "broad and inflated" language (Weizsäcker) of the whole passage is probably due to the subject, more than to Paul's employment of Silvanus, himself a prophet (*cf.* Acts xv. 32 and 1 Thess. ii. 12-16), as his amanuensis.

Ver. 9. The overwhelming manifestation of the divine glory sweeps from before it (pregnant **ἀπὸ**) into endless ruin the disobedient (Ps. lxxvi. 7) *men who* (see Moulton, 91 f.) *shall pay the penalty of* (see Prov. xxvii. 12, LXX) *eternal destruction* (the common apocalyptic belief, see Volz, *Jüd. Eschat.*, 286 f.).

Ver. 10. **ἐπιστώθη,** like the variant **ἐπιστεύθη,** is suggested by **πιστεύουσιν** (*cf.* a similar instance in iii. 3). The abrupt parenthesis ("you included—for") shows how Paul was thinking of the Thessalonians especially, while he depicted the bliss of the saints in general.—**ἐνδοξ.,** in one sense they were to be a credit and honour to their apostles (I., ii. 19 f.); in another, they were a glory to Christ Himself, by their ripened character—a Johannine touch (*cf.* John xvii. 10, and ver. 12 of this chapter; the parallel between **ἔργον πίστεως** and John vi. 29 is verbal).—**θαυμ.** = *to be wondered at* (by whom? *cf.* Ezek. xxxix. 21, Eph. iii. 10?) *in* (*i.e.*, by reason of, on account of) *believers;* for a partial parallel to the phrase see Isa. lxii. 6 (**καὶ ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτῶν θαυμασθήσεσθε**). If **ὅτι . . . ὑμᾶς** had been meant to give the reason for **θαυμασθῆναι** (so Zimmer, Wohl.), Paul would probably have put *God's witness* instead of *our witness*, and expressed the idea unambiguously; the transition from the **πᾶσιν** to the special case of the Thessalonians becomes, on this construction, an anti-climax. The rhythmical swing of 7*b*-10 suggests a reminiscence or quotation of some early Christian liturgical hymn, perhaps one of the prophetic **ψαλμοί** which he had heard at Corinth (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26).

Ver. 11. **καὶ κ.τ.λ.,** we pray as well as render thanks (ver. 3) for you. Unable any longer to give the Thessalonians their personal example and instructions—the time for that had passed (**ἐπιστώθη**)—Paul and his colleagues can still pray for them. The duties of a preacher or evangelist do not cease with the utterance of his message. **ἀξιώσῃ**: one proof that God deemed them worthy of His kingdom lay in the discipline of

[i] εὐδοκίαν [k] ἀγαθωσύνης καὶ ἔργον πίστεως [l] ἐν δυνάμει· 12. [h] ὅπως [m] ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ [n] ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν [j] Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν, [o] καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν [o] αὐτῷ, κατὰ τὴν χάριν [p] τοῦ Θεοῦ [p] ἡμῶν καὶ [q] Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

II. 1. Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, [a] ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου [l] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ [b] ἡμῶν [c] ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτόν, 2. [d] εἰς τὸ μὴ [e] ταχέως [f] σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς μηδὲ [g] θροεῖσθαι, μήτε διὰ πνεύματος, μήτε διὰ λόγου, μήτε δι' [h] ἐπιστολῆς (ὡς [i] δι'

i Contrast ii. 12; *cf.* on Rom. x. 1; Eph. i. 5.
k See on Rom. xv. 14 and Eph. v. 9.
l Col. i. 29.
m *Cf.* LXX; of Isa. xxiv. 15, lxvi. 5; Mal. i. 11; Ezek. xxxix. 21.
n = Person or character (*cf.* on Phil. ii. 9-10).
o John xvii. 1, 10, 21 f.
p So ver. 11.
q For κ. without article, *cf.* Win. § 19. 13 d, § 18. 7.
a "with regard to," = περί (an Ionism, *cf.* Meisterhans, *Gramm. d. attisch. Inschrift.* 182).
b See on i. 7.
c *Cf.* Matt. xxiv. 31; 2 Macc. ii. 7, etc.
d I. iii. 10.
e Gal. i. 6 = "hastily".
f See Acts xvii. 13; Sap. iv. 4.
g Elsewhere in N.T., only in Matt. xxiv. 6 (= Mk. xiii. 7).
h Forged? *cf.* Jos. *Vit.* xi., xxxv.
i Sc. γεγραμμένης.

[l] Om. ημων after Κυριου, with B, syr. (WH, Weiss, Findlay).

suffering by means of which He developed their patient faith (4, 5), but Paul here finds another proof of it in their broader development of moral character and vital religion (*cf.* 10). **πᾶσαν** includes **ἔργον** as well as **εὐδοκίαν**; the prayer is for success to every practical enterprise of faith as well as for the satisfaction of every aspiration and desire after moral excellence. Compare Dante's *Paradiso*, xviii. 58-60. **κλῆσις** is "the position you are called to occupy," "your vocation," as heirs of this splendid future—a not unnatural extension (*cf.* Phil. iii. 14) of its ordinary use (= 1 Cor. i. 26, etc.). This implies that a certain period of moral ripening must precede the final crisis. In ii. 1-iii. 5, Paul proceeds to elaborate this, in order to allay the feverish excitement at Thessalonica, while in iii. 6 f., he discusses the further ethical disorders caused by the church's too ardent hope. The heightened misery of the present situation must neither break down their patience (4 f.), nor on the other hand must it be taken as a proof that the end was imminent.

Ver. 12. Here at any rate it is impossible to take **χάριν** in a universalistic sense (so Robinson, *Ephesians*, pp. 225 f.), as though it implied that Christians were put on the same level as O.T. saints. The idea is the merciful favour of God, to the exclusion of human merit. The main topic of the letter is now brought forward; ii. 1-2 gives the occasion for the **λόγος παρακλήσεως** (3-12) which follows.

Chapter II.—Ver. 1. **ἐπισυν.**, a term whose verb was already in use for the muster of saints to the messianic reign. **—σαλ.** "get unsettled". Epictetus uses **ἀποσαλεύεσθαι** for the unsettling of the mind by sophistries (iii. 25), and the nearest equivalent for **νοῦς** here is our "mind". This mental agitation (aor.) results in **θροεῖσθαι** = nervous fear (Wrede, 48 f.) in prospect of the imminent end.

Ver. 2. **ὡς δι' ἡμῶν,** "purporting to come from us," goes with **ἐπιστολῆς** alone, for, while **λόγος** (Lünemann) might be grouped under it, **πνεῦμα** cannot. A visionary would claim personal, not borrowed, authority for his revelation. If **ὡς δ. ἡ.** went with the preceding verbs (so Dods, Askwith, 92 f., Wohl. = "we are the true interpreters of Paul's meaning"), an active (as in ver. 3) not a passive turn might have been expected to the sentence.—**ἐνέστηκεν** = "were already present". The cry was, **ὁ κύριος πάρεστι.** The final period had already begun, and the Thessalonians were probably referred to their sufferings as a proof of this. Paul could only guess the various channels along which such a misconception had flowed into the local church; either, *e.g.*, **πνεύματος,** the hallucination of some early Christian prophet at Thessalonica; or **λόγου,** oral statement, based in part perhaps on some calculation of contemporary history or on certain *logia* of Jesus; or **ἐπιστολῆς,** *i.e.*, the misinterpretation of some passage in 1 Thess. or in some lost letter of Paul. Possibly Paul imagined an epistle had been forged purporting to come from him or his companions, but we have no means of knowing whether his suspicion was well-founded or not. In any case the allusion is quite credible within his lifetime. Such expectations may have been excited in a more or less innocent fashion, but Paul peremptorily (ver. 3) ranks them all as dishonest; he is concerned not with their origin but with their mis-

ἡμῶν),[1] [k] ὡς [k] ὅτι [l] ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου. 3. Μή τις ὑμᾶς
[k] *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 21, "to the effect that".
[l] Rom. viii, 38, etc.
ἐξαπατήσῃ κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον· ὅτι [n] ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ [o] ἡ ἀποστασία
[m] Aor.conj. as in 2 Cor. xi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 11.
πρῶτον καὶ [q] ἀποκαλυφθῇ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας,[2] ὁ υἱὸς [r] τῆς
[n] Sc. "it shall not come" (ellipsis, as in. ver. 7).
ἀπωλείας, 4. ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ [s] πάντα λεγό-
[o] "The well known."
μενον [3] [s] θεὸν ἢ [t] σέβασμα, ὥστε αὐτὸν [u] εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσαι,
[p] = πρότερον (I. iv. 16).
[q] Matt. xxiv. 12.
[r] Win. § 30, 6, b; *cf.* Deissm. 163; Jub. x. 3.
[s] 1 Cor. viii. 5.
[t] Elsewhere in N.T., only in Acts xvii. 23 (Sap. xv. 17).
[u] Matt. xxiv. 15.
ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν [v] ὅτι ἐστὶ θεός. 5. οὐ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ἔτι ὢν
[v] By deeds as well as words, *cf.* Acts ii. 22; here = "proclaim".

[1] On ως δι ημων Field (202) writes: "Perhaps the apostle wrote ως δη ημων, as pretending to be ours," adding instances from Ast. *Lex. Plat.* to justify the latter's statement that "cum irrisione quadam plerumque ponitur ως δη".

[2] The ανομιας of ℵB min., cop., arm., Euth., Dam., Tert., Amb. (Ti., Tr., WH, Zim., Bj., Findlay, Lgft.), is preferable to the Western paraphrastic αμαρτιας (Alford, Ellic., Wohl., Weiss).

[3] Bentl. conj. επι παν το λεγομενον.

chievous effects upon the church (*cf.* Matt. xxiv. 4). Probably his suspicions of misinterpretation were due to his recent experiences in Galatia, though the Macedonian churches seem to have escaped any infusion of the anti-Pauline propaganda which soured Corinth not long afterwards.

Ver. 3. **καὶ ἀποκ.**, the apostasy and the appearance (so of Beliar, *Asc. Isa.*, iv. 18) of the personal anti- hrist or pseudo-Christ form a single phenomenon. From the use of **ἡ ἀποστασία** as a Greek equivalent for Belial (LXX of 1 Kings xxi. 13, A, and Aquila), this eschatological application of the term would naturally flow, especially as אִישׁ בְּלִיָּעַל might well be represented by **ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας** on the analogy of 2 Sam. xxii. 5 (LXX) = Ps. xvii. (xviii.). 4. Lawlessness was a cardinal trait in the Jewish figure of Belial, as was persecution of the righteous (i. 4, ii. 7, see *Asc. Isa.*, ii. 5, etc.). The very order of the following description (**ἀπωλείας** set between **ἀνομίας** and **ὁ ἀντικείμενος**, etc., unchronologically, but dramatically) suggests that this incarnation of lawlessness was a doomed figure, although he challenged and usurped divine prerogatives. He is another Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. xi. 36, **καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ἐπὶ πάντα θεὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τῶν θεῶν ἔξαλλα λαλήσει**, though Paul carefully safeguards himself against misconception by inserting **λεγόμενον** in his quotation of the words). This conception of a supernatural antagonist to Jesus Christ at the end is the chief element of novelty introduced by Paul, from Jewish traditions, into the primitive Christian eschatology. The recent attempt of Caligula to erect a statue of himself in the Temple at Jerusalem may have furnished a trait for Paul's delineation of the future Deceiver; the fearful impiety of this outburst had sent a profound shock through Judaism, which would be felt by Jewish Christians as well. But Paul does not identify the final Deception with the Imperial cultus, which was far from a prominent feature when he wrote. His point is that the last pseudo-Messiah or anti-Christ will em ody all that is profane and blas hemous, every conceivable element of impiety; and that, instead of being repudiated, he will be welcomed by Jews as well as pagans (*cf.* Acts xii. 21, 22).

Ver. 5. It was no after-thought, on Paul's part (the singular rules out Spitta's idea that Timothy wrote this apocalyptic piece). Nor was it an idiosyncrasy of his teaching. Especially since the days of Antiochus Ep phanes (Dan. vii., xi.; *cf.* Gunkel's *Schöpfung u. Chaos*, 221 f.), a more or less esoteric and varied Jewish tradition had pervaded pious circles, that the last days would be heralded by a proud uprising against God. The champion of this movement was no longer the Dragon or cosmic opponent of God, as in the older mythology (though traces of this belief still linger), but an individual (**ὁ ἄνομος**) who incorporates human wickedness (**τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας**) and infernal cunning in his own person, and who essays to supplant and suppress the worship of the true God, by claiming divine honours for himself.

πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν; 6. καὶ νῦν τὸ [w] κατέχον [x] οἴδατε εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ [y] καιρῷ. 7. τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται [z] τῆς ἀνομίας, [a] μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται· 8. [b] καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος, ὃν ὁ Κύριος [1]Ἰησοῦς [c] ἀνελεῖ [d] τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος [d] αὐτοῦ καὶ [e] καταργήσει τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ· 9. οὗ ἐστιν ἡ παρουσία κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ [f] σημείοις καὶ τέρασι [f] ψεύδους 10. καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ [g] ἀδικίας [h] τοῖς [i] ἀπολλυμένοις, [k] ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ [l] ἐδέξαντο εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι

w = κωλύον (Chrys.). x Matt. xiii. 11, etc. y "Appointed season" (as Dan. xi. 29, 35). z Epexeg. genit. a Gal. ii. 10. b Common eschat. formula (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 5, etc.). c Post-classical, Win. § 13, 5. d From Isa. xi. 4 (LXX), copied in Ps. Sol. xvii. 27, 41; *cf.* Job iv. 9, 4 Esd. xiii. 38. e See on 1 Cor. i. 28. f *Cf.* on 2 Cor. xii. 12; Matt. xxiv. 24. g Gen. of origin. h Dat. incommodi (Blass, § 37, 2), as in 1 Cor. i. 18; *cf.* Moulton, 114-115 ("strongly durative though the verb is, we see perfectivity in the fact that the goal is *ideally* reached"). i *Cf.* on 2 Cor. ii. 15. k See on Acts xii. 23. l Contrast I. i. 6, ii. 13.

He is Satan's messiah, an infernal caricature of the true messiah. *Cf. Asc. Isa.*, iv. 6, where it is said that Belial "will do and speak like the Beloved and he will say, I am God and before me there has been none".

Ver. 6. *Well now, you know what restrains him from being manifested* (coming fully into play and sight) *before his appointed season.* **Νῦν** probably goes with **οἴδατε**, not with **τὸ κατέχον** (as *e.g.*, in John iv. 18, so Olshausen, Bisping, Wieseler, Zahn, Wrede), and **καὶ νῦν** is not temporal, but "a mere adverb of passage" (Lünemann, Alford) in the argument (so with **οἶδα** in Acts iii. 17). Were **νῦν** temporal, it would mean (*a*) that during the interval between Paul's teaching and the arrival of this letter fresh circumstances (so Zimmer) had arisen to throw light on the thwarting of the adversary. But of this there is no hint whatsoever in the context. Or (*b*), preferably, it would contrast with the following **ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ καιρῷ**, as an equivalent for "already" (Hofmann, Wohl., Milligan, etc.).

Ver. 7. **γὰρ**, explaining **οἴδατε**. The **κατέχων** is a fact of present experience and observation, which accounts for the **ἀνομία** being as yet a **μυστήριον**, operating secretly, and not an **ἀποκάλυψις**. Paul does not say by whom (the **ἄνομος** himself?) the restraint is removed.—**μόνον**, the hiatus must be filled up with some phrase like "it cannot be manifested". Its real character and full scope are not yet disclosed. For **ἄρτι** = **νῦν**, *cf.* Nägeli's note in *der Wortschätz des Apostels Paulus* (36, 37), and for omission of **ἄν**, Blass, § 65, 10.

Ver. 8. **ὅν, κ.τ.λ.**, his career is short and tragic. The apparition (*cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 14, etc., Thieme, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia*, 34 f.) of Jesus heralds his overthrow.—**ἐπιφανείᾳ** = sudden appearance of a deity at some crisis (*cf.* Diod., *Sicul.*, i. 25), as the god in 2 Macc. ii. 21, iii. 24, etc. "In hieratic inscriptions the appearing of the god in visible form to men is commonly expressed by the same word" (Ramsay, *Exp. Ti.*, x. 208). This passage, with its fierce messianic anticipation of the adversary's doom interrupts the description of his mission which is resumed (in ver. 9) with an account of the inspiration (**κατὰ**), method (**ἐν**) and results (ver. 10), of this evil advent. Galen (*de facult. nat.*, i. 2, 4-5) physiologically defines **ἐνέργεια** as the process of activity whose product is **ἔργον**. The impulse to **ἐνέργεια** is **δύναμις**. The **δύναμις** of this supernatural delusion is specially manifested in *signs and wonders*. The power of working miracles in order to deceive people (ver. 11) was an accepted trait in the Jewish and early Christian ideas of such eschatological opponents of God (*cf.* on Rev. xiii. 13, and Friedländer's *Geschichte d. jüd. Apolog.*, 493 f.).

Ver. 10. **ἀγάπη** (*cf.* ver. 12) here, as Luke xi. 42, with obj. gen. *Cf. Asc. Isa.*, iv. 15, 16: "And He will give rest [above, ch. i. 7] to the godly whom He shall find in the body in this world, and to all who because of their faith in Him have execrated Beliar and his kings". **ἀλήθεια**, not = "truth" in the general sense of the term (Lünemann, Lightfoot, Zimmer) but = "the truth of the gospel" (as usual in Paul) as against **ἀδικία** and **ψεῦδος** (Rom. i. 15 f., ii. 8). The apostle holds that the refusal to open one's mind and heart to the gospel leaves life a prey to moral delusion; judicial infatua-

αὐτούς· 11. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο [m]πέμπει αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ἐνέργειαν [n]πλάνης,
εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι αὐτοὺς τῷ ψεύδει· 12. ἵνα [o]κριθῶσι πάντες οἱ μὴ
πιστεύσαντες τῇ [p]ἀληθείᾳ ἀλλ' [q]εὐδοκήσαντες τῇ [p]ἀδικίᾳ. 13.
[r]Ἡμεῖς δὲ [r]ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ Θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, [s]ἀδελ-
φοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου, ὅτι [t]εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς [u]ἀπαρχὴν [1] εἰς
σωτηρίαν ἐν [v]ἁγιασμῷ [v]πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας, 14. εἰς [w]ὃ
ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς διὰ τοῦ [x]εὐαγγελίου [x]ἡμῶν, εἰς [y]περιποίησιν δόξης
τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 15. [z]ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, [a]στήκετε
καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς [b]παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε, εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι',

m See Ezek. xx. 24-25, and Rom. i. 24, 26, 28, etc.
n Sap. v. 6-7.
o = κατακρ. (as Heb. xiii. 4, etc.).
p See on Rom. i. 18, and 1 Cor. xiii. 6.
q Contrast i. 11.
r i. 3.
s *Cf.* I. i. 4 (in similar connexion).
t Alexandrian form (Win. § 13, 13); *cf.* Deut. xxvi. 18.
u Rom. xi. 16, xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 20, etc.;
v I. iv. 7-8.
w *i.e.*, general position reflected in ver. 13.
x *Cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 3.
y *Cf.* I. v. 9.
z *Cf.* I. v. 6; resumes thought of ii. 1-2.
a *Cf.* I. iii. 8 and 1 Cor. xvi. 13.
b See iii. 6 and 1 Cor. xi. 2.

[1] The singular variant **απαρχην**, adopted by Lach., WH marg., Weiss (Lgft.?) from BG^{gr}P, min., f. vg., syr.p, Euth., Dam., etc., is preferable to the strongly supported **απ αρχης** (Pauline **απ. ευρ.**, in historical sense of Phil. iv. 15, Ac. xv. 7, etc.). The Thessalonians or Macedonians are *first-fruits*, as contrasted with others yet to follow (*cf.* iii. 1, and i. 4).

tion is the penalty of disobedience to the truth of God in Christ.

Ver. 11. An echo of the primitive Semitic view (still extant, *cf.* Curtis's *Prim. Sem. Religion To-Day*, pp. 69 f.), that God may deliberately lead men astray, or permit them to be fatally infatuated, as a penal discipline (*cf.* Ps. Sol. viii. 15; Test. XII. Patr. Dan. ix.). A modern would view the same phenomenon as wilful scepticism issuing in superstition, or in inability to distinguish truth from falsehood. Delusions of this kind cannot befall believers (*cf.* Mark xiii. 22; Test. Issach. iii.). In Test. Napht. iii. 3, idols are **πνεύματα πλάνης** (*cf.* Test. Levi. iii. 3, etc.).

Ver. 12. Like the prophet John half a century later (xiii. 2 f.), Paul distinguishes his anti-Christ or antitheistic hero from the Satan whose campaign he executes; but, unlike John, the apostle has nothing to say about the fate of Satan. The tools and the victims of Satan are destroyed, and they alone.—**εὐδοκ.** not with **ἐν** as usual, but with the less common (*cf. e.g.*, 1 Macc. i. 43, **καὶ πολλοὶ ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ ηὐδόκησαν τῇ λατρίᾳ αὐτοῦ**) dative. "And the greater number of those who shall have been associated together in order to receive the Beloved he [*i.e.*, Beliar] will turn aside after him" (*Asc. Isa.*, iv. 9).

Ver. 13-CHAPTER III.-Ver. 5. Thanks, prayers and counsels.

Ver. 13. God has chosen you (**εἵλατο**, another LXX expression, implying that Christians had now succeeded to the cherished priviliges of God's people) to be saved, instead of visiting you with a deadly delusion (10, 11) which ends in judgment (12); your discipline is of sanctification (contrast 12*b*) and belief in what is true (contrast 11, 12*a*), these forming the sphere and the scope (*cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 15, and for **ἐν ἁγιασμῷ** in this sense Ps. Sol. xvii. 33) for salvation being realised. Those who are sanctified and who truly believe shall be saved. *Cf.* ver. 14 and *Apoc. Bar.*, liv. 21: "in fine enim saeculi uindicta erit de iis qui improbe egerunt, iuxta improbitatem eorum, et glorificabis fideles iuxta fidem eorum".—**πνεύματος** may be either (*a*) = "wrought by the (holy) Spirit" (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 2), the divine side of the human **πίστει**, or (*b*) = "of the spirit" (*cf.* I. v. 23; 2 Cor. vii. 1), as of the heart (I., iii. 13). The absence of the article is not decisive against the former rendering, but the latter is the more probable in view of the context; the process of **ἁγιασμός** involves a love of the truth and a belief in it (*i.e.*, in the true gospel) which is opposed to religious delusions (*cf.* ii. 2).

Ver. 14. To be saved ultimately (12) is to possess or rather to share the glory of Christ (*cf.* I., ii. 12).

Ver. 15. The divine purpose does not work automatically, but implies the co-operation of Christians—in this case, a resolute stedfastness resting on loyalty to the apostolic gospel. In view of passages like 1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 5, it is gratuitous to read any second-century passion for oral apostolic tradition into these words or into those of iii. 6.

[c] ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν. 16. [d] αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ [d] ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, ὁ ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς [e] καὶ δοὺς [f] παράκλησιν [g] αἰωνίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα ἀγαθὴν [h] ἐν χάριτι, 17. [i] παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας καὶ [i] στηρίξαι [k] ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ [l] λόγῳ [l] ἀγαθῷ.

III. 1. [a] Τὸ λοιπόν, [b] προσεύχεσθε, ἀδελφοί, περὶ [b] ἡμῶν, ἵνα [c] ὁ λόγος τοῦ [c] Κυρίου [d] τρέχῃ καὶ [e] δοξάζηται καθὼς καὶ [f] πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 2. καὶ ἵνα [g] ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν [h] ἀτόπων καὶ [h] πονηρῶν [i] ἀνθρώπων· [k] οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις. 3. [l] πιστὸς δέ ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος, ὃς [m] στηρίξει ὑμᾶς καὶ [n] φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. 4. [o] πεποίθαμεν δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ [l] ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ἃ παραγγέλλομεν ποιεῖτε [p] καὶ ποιήσετε. 5. ὁ δὲ

c I. v. 27. d For order, *cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 13. e *Cf.* Rom. v. 5, 8. f See on 2 Cor. i. 3-7. g Contrast i. 9. h = "graciously." i *Cf.* I. iii. 11, 13. k 1 Cor. i. 5. l *Cf.* Lk. xxiv. 19; Thuc. i. 139, 4; Test. Gad, vi. 1. a I. iv. 1; Eph. vi. 10. b I. v. 25. c I. i. 8. d Ps. cxlvii. 15, etc. (LXX), contrast 2 Tim. ii. 9. e In sense of Acts xiii. 48. f I. iii. 4. g *Cf.* Rom. xv. 31; 2 Ti. iv. 17; Ps. Sol. iv. 27. h See on Acts xxviii. 6; Isa. xxv. 4 (LXX); and on I. lii. 3, "misguided and unprincipled" (Rutherford). i *e.g.*, in Corinth; *cf.* Acts xviii. 6 f. 2 Ti. iii. 13. k *Cf.* Rom. x. 16 with Acts xvii. 12, 34. l *Cf.* i. 10, Acts xviii. 9 f. m ii. 17. n 2 Ti. iv. 18. o 2 Co. ii. 3. p *Cf.* I. iv. 10.

Ver. 16. **αὐτὸς δὲ**, perhaps with a slight implicit apposition to the *you* or *we* of the previous sentence.—**ἀγαπήσας καὶ δοὺς, κ.τ.λ.**, connection as in John iii. 16.—**παράκλησιν** for this world, **ἐλπίδα** for the world to come; all hope is encouragement, but not vice-versa.

Ver. 17, in contrast to the disquiet and confusion of ii. 2. **ἔργῳ** as in i. 11, iii. 4, 7 f., **λόγῳ** as iii. 1, 15; I., i. 8. See the fulsome pagan inscription of Halicarnassus, which after giving thanks for the birth of Augustus, **σωτῆρα τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους**, declares that men now are full of **ἐλπίδων μὲν χρηστῶν πρὸς τὸ μέλλον, εὐθυμίας δὲ εἰς τὸ παρόν.** Contrast also the **κενὴ ἐλπίς** of the impious in Sap. iii. 11.

CHAPTER III.—Ver. 1. In addition to offering prayers on their behalf, Paul asks them to pray for the continued success of the gospel ("may others be as blest as we are"!) and (ver. 2), for its agents' safety (Isa. xxv. 4, LXX, a reminiscence of). The opponents here are evidently (ii. 10 f.) beyond hope of conversion; preservation from their wiles is all that can be expected. For a speedy answer to this prayer, see Acts xviii. 9 f. The repeated use of **ὁ Κύριος** in vv. 1-5, brings out the control of God amid the plots and passions of mankind.—**ἀτόπων.** The general sense of the term is given by Philo in his queer allegorising of Gen. iii. 9 (*Leg. Alleg.*, iii. 17, **ἄτοπος λέγεται εἶναι ὁ φαῦλος**); commonly it is used, as elsewhere in the N.T., of things, but here of persons, either as = "ill-disposed," or, in a less general and derivative sense = "perverse" (*cf.* Nägeli, *der Wortschatz des Paulus*, p. 37), or "froward". The general aim of the passage is to widen the horizon of the Thessalonians, by enlisting their sympathy and interest on behalf of the apostles. They are not the only sufferers, or the only people who need prayer and help.—**οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς εἰς Κόρινθόν ἐσθ' ὁ πλοῦς**, so ran the ancient proverb. Paul writes from Corinth that while everyone has the chance, not all have the desire, to arrive at the faith. **ἡ πίστις** is the faith of the gospel, or Christianity. By a characteristic play upon the word, Paul (ver. 3), hurries on to add, "but the Lord is faithful". **ὑμᾶς** (for which Bentley and Baljon plausibly conjecture **ἡμᾶς**) shows how lightly his mind rests on thoughts of his own peril as compared with the need of others. It is impossible to decide, either from the grammar or from the context, whether **τοῦ πονηροῦ** is neuter or masculine. Either sense would suit, though, if there is a reminiscence here of the Lord's prayer (so Feine, *Jesus Christus u. Paulus*, 252 f., and Chase, *Texts and Studies*, i. 3. 112 f.), the masculine would be inevitable, as is indeed more probable for general reasons (so *e.g.*, Hofmann, Everling, Ellicott, etc.)

Ver. 4. **πεποίθαμεν** (= we have faith), still playing on the notion of **πίστις.** Paul rallies the Thessalonians by reminding them, not only of God's faithfulness, but of their friends' belief in them.

Ver. 5. **κατευθύναι, κ.τ.λ.** Paul no longer (I., iii. 11) entertains the hope of revisiting them soon. "God's love and Christ's patient endurance" (*i.e.*, the **ὑπομονή** which Christ inspires and re-

Κύριος [q] κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν [r] ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

6. [s] Παραγγέλλομεν δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, [t] ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [u] στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ [v] ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε [1] παρ' ἡμῶν. 7. αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε πῶς δεῖ [w] μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς· ὅτι οὐκ ἠτακτήσαμεν ἐν ὑμῖν, 8. [x] οὐδὲ δωρεὰν ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν παρά τινος, ἀλλ' [y] ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ [z] ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν· 9. [a] οὐχ ὅτι οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς [b] τύπον δῶμεν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ [b] μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς. 10. καὶ γὰρ ὅτε ἦμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τοῦτο παρηγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι [c] εἴ τις οὐ θέλει ἐργάζ-

q 1 Chron. xxix. 18 (LXX), Ps. Sol. xii. 6, etc.
r *Cf.* ii. 16; *cf.* Abbott, *Joh. Gramm.* 2033 b.
s *Cf.* Ignat. *ad Polyk.* 5.
t See on 1 Cor. i. 10.
u See on 2 Cor. viii. 20.
v *Cf.* I. v. 14, "a loafer" (Rutherford).
w *Cf.* I. i. 6, ii. 14, and on 1 Cor. iv. 16.
x I. ii. 3, v. 5.
y *Cf.* I. ii. 9, 2 Cor. xi. 27, Herm. *Sim.* v. 6, 2, etc., "toiling and moiling" (Rutherford).
z I. ii. 9 (with a different motive).
a See on 1 Cor. ix. 3-18, and 2 Cor. i. 24.
b See on Phil. iii. 17.
c Did. xii. 3.

[1] Read **παρελαβετε**, with BG, 43, 73, 80, g, goth., syr.P, arm., etc. (so Lach., Tr., WH, Bj., Weiss), or **παρελαβοσαν** (**ελαβοσαν** D*) with ℵ*A, d, e, 17, etc. (Ti., Al., Zim., Lgft., Wohl., Findlay [Tr., WH, Lach., all in marg.]).

quires, *cf.* Ignat. *ad. Rom.*, last words) correspond to the double experience of love and hope in ii. 16. It is by the sense of God's love alone, not by any mere acquiescence in His will or stoical endurance of it, that the patience and courage of the Christian are sustained. *Cf. Ep. Arist.*, 195, **ἐπὶ τῶν καλλίστων πράξεων οὐκ αὐτοὶ κατευθύνομεν τὰ βουλευθέντα· θεὸς δὲ τελειοῖ τὰ πάντων.** Connect with ver. 3 and *cf.* Mrs. Browning's line, "I waited with patience, which means almost power".

Vv. 6-16. Injunctions upon church-life and order.

Ver. 6. How necessary it was to promote **ὑπομονή** with its attendant virtues of diligence and order at Thessalonica, is evident from the authoritative (**ἐν ὀν. τ. Κυρίου**) tone and the crisp detail of the following paragraph. **Παραγγ.**, like **ἀτάκτως**, has a military tinge (*cf.* on I. iv. 2, and Dante's *Paradiso*, xii. 37-45). **στελλ.**, for his own sake (ver. 14), as well as for yours: a service as well as a precaution. The collective action of his fellow-Christians, besides preserving (1 Cor. v. 6) themselves from infection—and nothing is so infectious as an insubordinate, indolent, interfering spirit — will bring home to him a sense of his fault. Lightfoot aptly cites the **παράγγελμα** of Germanicus to his mutinous troops: "discedite a contactu, ac diuidite turbidos: id stabile ad paenitentiam, id fidei uinculum erit" (Tacit. *Annal.*, i. 43).—The **ἄτακτοι** of 6-12 are excitable members who "break the ranks" by stopping work in view of the near advent, and thus not only disorganise social life but burden the church with their maintenance. The apostles had not been idle or hare-brained enthusiasts, and their example of an orderly, self-supporting life is held up as a pattern. Insubordination of this kind is a breach of the apostolic standard of the Christian life, and Paul deals sharply with the first symptoms of it. He will not listen to any pious pleas for this kind of conduct.

Ver. 8. Paul's practice of a trade and emphasis upon the moral discipline of work are quite in keeping with the best Jewish traditions of the period. Compare *e.g.*, the saying of Gamaliel II. (*Kiddusch.* i. 11): "He who possesses a trade is like a fenced vineyard, into which no cattle can enter, etc."—**δωρεάν** = "for nothing, gratis".

Ver. 9. The apostles had the right to be maintained by the church, but in this case they had refused to avail themselves of it. The Thessalonians are not to misconstrue their action.

Ver. 10. Precept as well as example (*DCG*, ii. 2). As is perhaps implied in **ὅτι, εἰ . . . ἐσθιέτω** is a maxim quoted by the apostle, not from some unwritten saying of Jesus (Resch) but from the Jewish counterparts, based on Gen. iii. 19, which are cited by Wetstein, especially *Beresch. rabba*, xiv. 12: "ut, si non laborat, non manducet". *Cf.* Carlyle's *Chartism*, chap. iii ("In all ways it needs, especially in these times, to be proclaimed

εσθαι, μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω. 11. [d] ἀκούομεν γάρ τινας περιπατοῦντας ἐν ὑμῖν ἀτάκτως, μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ [e] περιεργαζομένους. 12. τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις παραγγέλλομεν καὶ [f] παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ [g] ἵνα μετὰ [h] ἡσυχίας ἐργαζόμενοι τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν. 13. ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοί, μὴ [i] ἐγκακήσητε [k] καλοποιοῦντες. 14. εἰ δέ τις οὐχ ὑπακούει τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ [l] τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, τοῦτον [m] σημειοῦσθε, μὴ [n] συναναμίγνυσθαι αὐτῷ, ἵνα [o] ἐντραπῇ· 15. καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν [p] ἡγεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ [q] νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν. 16. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης [r] δώῃ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰρήνην [s] διὰ παντὸς ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ.

d "We are informed" (as 1 Cor. xi. 18).
e For the paronomasia, see Blass, § 82, 4, and Deissm. 225.
f Sc. αὐτούς.
g *Cf.* on 1. iv. 1.
h *Cf.* on Acts xi. 18.
i *Cf.* on Gal. vi. 9; Eph. iii. 13.

k Only here in N.T. l *i.e.*, not 1 Thess. (so Lünemann, Schmiedel, Schäfer) but (so Pelt, Lgft., Findlay, etc.) the present, Win. § 18, 4. m Only here in N.T. n *Cf.* 1 Cor. v. 9 f. o *Cf.* Tit. ii. 8. p *Cf.* Job xix. 11 (LXX). q *Cf.* 1. v. 14, 1 Cor. iv. 14, and 2 Cor. ii. 7. r Opt. without ἄν, as in 1 Peter i. 2; Hellenistic opt., Win. § 14, 10. s = "continually" Lk. xxiv. 53, Ps. Sol. ii. 40, etc.

aloud that for the idle man there is no place in this England . . . he that will not work according to his faculty, let him perish according to his necessity"). The use of **ἐν Κυρίῳ** here and in 1 Cor. xi. 11 (*cf.* Matt. xix. 4 f.) proves, as Titius argues (*der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit*, 1900, p. 105), that the original divine ideas of the Creation are fulfilled and realised in the light of Christ's gospel; the entire process of human life culminates in the faith of Christ, and therefore no unqualified antithesis can be drawn between ordinary life and Christian conduct.

Ver. 11. The **γάρ** goes back to ver. 6. "Whereas I am told that some of your number are behaving in a disorderly fashion, not busy but busybodies," fussy and officious, doing anything but attending to their daily trade. "Ab otio ualde procliue est hominum ingenium ad curiositatem" (Bengel). The first persecution at Thessalonica had been fostered by a number of fanatical loungers (Acts xvii. 5). On the sensible attitude of the primitive church to labour, see Harnack's *Expansion*, i. 215 f. M. Aurelius (iii. 4) warns people against idle, fussy habits, but especially against **τὸ περίεργον καὶ κακόηθες**, and an apt parallel to this use of **ἀτάκτως** lies in Dem. *Olynth.*, iii. 34: **ὅσα** (funds or food) **οὗτος ἀτάκτως νῦν λαμβάνων** (*i.e.*, takes without rendering personal service in the field) **οὐκ ὠφελεῖ, ταῦτ' ἐν ἰσῇ τάξει λαμβανέτω.**

Ver. 12. They are not directly addressed (contrast 6, 13).—**μετὰ ἡσυχίας**, in the homely sphere of work. The three causes of disquiet at Thessalonica are (*a*) the disturbing effect of persecution, (*b*) the tension produced by the thought of the advent of Christ, and (*c*), as an outcome of the latter, irregularity and social disorganisation in the community.

Ver. 13. **ὑμεῖς δέ**, whoever else drops out of the ranks of industrious, steady Christians.—**μὴ ἐγκ.**, implying that they had not begun to grow slack (Moulton, 122 f.). Perhaps with a special allusion to the presence of people who abused charity; generous Christians must not forego liberality and help, arguing that it is no use to succour any because some will take advantage of the church's largess.

Ver. 14. **διὰ τ. ἐπ.**, implying that the matter ends with this letter (Weiss); Paul has spoken his last word on the subject. With this and the following verse, *cf.* Did. xv. 3 (**ἐλέγχετε δὲ ἀλλήλους μὴ ἐν ὀργῇ ἀλλ' ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· καὶ παντὶ ἀστοχοῦντι κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου μηδεὶς λαλείτω μηδὲ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀκουέτω, ἕως οὗ μετανοήσῃ**).—**ἐντραπῇ**, "be ashamed" (= **αἰδεῖσθαι** as often).

Ver. 15. Disapproval, as a means of moral discipline, loses all its effect if the offender does not realise its object and reason (**νουθετεῖτε**), or if it is tainted with personal hostility.—**ὡς ἀδελφόν.** Compare the fine saying of Rabbi Chanina ben Gamaliel on Deut. xxv. 3, that after the punishment the offender is expressly called brother, not sinner.

Ver. 16. **εἰρήνην**, as opposed to these fears and troubles of the church. **Κύριος** is probably, in accordance with Paul's usual practice, to be taken as = Jesus Christ, but the language of ver. 5 and of

t Emphatic: the censured as well as the steady members.

ὁ Κύριος μετὰ [t] πάντων ὑμῶν.

17. ὁ [u] ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, ὅ ἐστι σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ· [v] οὕτω γράφω.

u *Cf.* on 1 Cor. xvi. 21, and 2 Cor. xiii. 13.

18. ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ [t] πάντων ὑμῶν.

v Autograph as means of recognising authenticity, *cf.* Abbott, *Joh. Gram.* 2691, and Cicero's *Catil.* iii. 5, Plautus, *Bacch.* iv. 4, 78, etc.

I., v. 23, makes the reference to God quite possible.

Vv. 17, 18. Conclusion. Paul now takes the pen from his amanuensis, to add the salutation in his own handwriting for the purpose of authenticating the epistle (otherwise in 1 Cor. xvi. 21). This, he observes, is the sign-manual of his letters (*cf.* ii. 2), *i.e.*, the fact of a personal written greeting at the close, not any form of words (like ver. 18), or the use of the word "grace," or "certum quendam nexum literarium" (Grotius). The precaution is natural, in view of his suspicion about unauthorised communications. Compare "the **σεσημείωμαι** (generally contracted into **σεση**) with which so many of the Egyptian papyrus-letters and ostraca close" (Milligan, p. 130), or the postscript in one's own handwriting (**ξύμβολον**) which guaranteed an ancient letter (Deissmann: *Licht vom Osten*, 105). **μετά** (*cf.* ver. 16), the divine presence is realised through the experience of Christ s grace.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

PRELIMINARY.

Those who propose to read this exposition of the Pastoral Epistles may find it convenient to be apprised at the outset of the conclusions assumed in it concerning the genuineness and integrity of the Letters. After a careful review of the arguments adduced by the traditionalists and the anti-traditionalists, and after the devotion of considerable thought to a minute study of the Epistles themselves, the present writer finds it easier to believe that St. Paul was the author of them, as they have come down to us, than that a Paulinist (assuming that there ever was a special school of Pauline thought), sometime between 90 and 120 A.D., worked up a few fragments of genuine letters of his master into 2 Timothy and Titus, and then composed 1 Timothy in imitation of his own style. This second alternative represents, broadly speaking, the theory of the anti-traditional school of critics.

The only serious difficulties which preclude an unhesitating acceptance of these letters, as they stand, as the composition of St. Paul, lie in (1), the style, which, although fundamentally not un-Pauline, presents undeniably certain obvious peculiarities which are not found in any of the ten other Pauline letters, and (2) in the writer's outlook on religion—in particular, the relations of God and Christ respectively to man's salvation, and the place of faith and works in the spiritual life—which seems to be that of one who had travelled on the Pauline road (assuming that there was a public highway that could be so described), further than we should have deemed it possible in the years—few at most—which separate the close of St. Paul's life from the date of the Epistles of the first Roman captivity. The main features of the landscape are the same, but the distances are different.

On the other hand, this altered theological outlook, as well as the writer's concern about Church institutions, is responsible for the

peculiar religious phraseology in so far as it does indeed differ from features common to the earlier groups of letters; so that whatever considerations help us to account for the former change will also aid in the solution of the problem of style and vocabulary.

The other arguments against the Pauline authorship, based on: (3) the impossibility of fitting into the Acts of the Apostles the personal and local references in the Pastorals, (4) the alleged marks of the second century in the heresy which is combated, and (5) the allegation that the details of Church organisation reflect the policy of the dominant party of the early second century—are, it is believed, assumptions for which there is no foundation. And, in fact, (4) and (5) are not now insisted on by many of the anti-traditional school, and will not be dealt with in this introduction.

Before passing on to a brief discussion of the style and the historical setting of the Epistles, it will not be amiss to suggest some considerations which may help, not indeed to solve the problem before us, but to enable us to believe that it would not be a problem at all could we only know a little more about the personal history of St. Paul, and of the inner life of the Christian Church in the first century. In the first place, we must remember that it was a period of intensely vigorous and rapidly developing Church life. We are so much accustomed to regard as normal Christian communities in which nine-tenths of the professed adherents are spiritually only half alive, that we find it difficult to realise what manner of thing Church life was when every one took a keen interest in his religion, and the spiritual life of every Church member was full and strong, even if not always consistent. The years that elapsed between Pentecost and 100 A.D. represent the infancy of the Church; and we all know how momentous in their after consequences are a child's experiences during the first five or six years of its life. But the first century was even more significant for the subsequent history of the Church than is infancy in the case of a human being. The development of the Church, as we experience it, at least in Europe, is slow; looking back thirty years we can indeed perceive some change; but in the first century a year wrought what it now takes a generation to effect. What we know of the rapid development in applied science in our own day supplies us with an experience somewhat analogous to the growth of the Christian Church—doctrinally and institutionally—in the first century. We have seen in the space of ten, or even five, years a complete revolution in men's notions as to what is possible and reasonable in the rate of travel on the high road or in the air.

It was while the Church was thus rapidly taking shape that St. Paul came into it; and, if we may judge from the extant evidence, he quickly became the most powerful constructive force in it. But there were other agencies at work, human, as well as Divine and divinely inspired, and St. Paul was himself wrought on and shaped as much, or more, than he shaped others. Always a student but never a recluse, he shared to the full the common life of the unexclusive early Church. He did not "dwell apart," though always conscious that his innermost life was "hid with Christ in God". And not only did his life move with the Church's life, but it was brought into close touch with every possible human experience—except those of domestic life—to a degree rarely equalled by any other man. The label that correctly describes the contents of a given human personality to-day may be, in some cases, not misleading five or ten years hence; but St. Paul was not one of these constant quantities. His personality was not that of a Milton, self-determining, holding on its course "like a star," unaffected by the storms of the lower atmosphere; he was as sympathetic, and therefore open to impressions from without, as if he had been a weak man. Of this impressionableness and craving for sympathy we have abundant evidence in the Epistles that are universally acknowledged to be genuine. Such a man is likely to undergo changes in mental outlook, to become possessed by fresh ideals and conceptions, so as to bewilder less agile minds; and, of course, new thoughts require for their expression words and phrases for which the man had no use before. In the case of St. Paul, this is no imaginary supposition. The difference between the Paul of Philippians and the Paul of 1 Timothy is not greater than, perhaps not as great as, between the Paul of Thessalonians and the Paul of Ephesians. The fact just noticed should put us on our guard against the easy assumption that the normal Pauline presentation of the relations between God and man is that found in the central group of his Epistles: Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians.

There is, however, a difference between the Pastorals and the earlier letters for which the lapse of time alone cannot account, and that is a diminution in force. The letters to Timothy and Titus are certainly of apostolic quality; the ordinary reader, and still more the student, who compares them with the best of the sub-apostolic literature, can at once perceive the difference between what is inspired and what is merely interesting, edifying, and even noble. Nevertheless, we miss in the Pastorals the exuberant vigour, the reserved strength of the earlier letters. The explanation of this may well be

that before St. Paul wrote these letters he had ceased to be an elderly, and had, perhaps rapidly, become an old man. There is nothing impossible in this supposition. The surprising thing is that it has not been more generally recognised as a probable factor in the solution of the problem presented by the Pastorals. When we think of the intensity with which St. Paul had lived his life—always at high pressure—and what a hard life it had been, it would be a marvel indeed if old age with its diminished powers had not come suddenly upon him.

We hold then that the author of the Pastorals was Paul; but "Paul the aged"; much more aged, and more truly so, than when he penned his note to Philemon. We may observe, as a sign of old age, a certain inertia which makes him satisfied to express his meaning in habitual, almost stereotyped, words and phrases; words and phrases which are only open to the objection—in itself unreasonable—that we have heard them quite recently. The brain no longer responds to the will to utter "words that burn"; and it seems as fitful in the origination of "thoughts that breathe". It is not that St. Paul is not truly inspired in the Pastorals. These letters satisfy the practical test of inspiration, *viz.*, their yield of matter for thought is never exhausted by study. There are, moreover, several passages in them that have touched the hearts of Christians in every age as nearly as anything the apostle ever wrote. But even in these, perhaps more in these than in less striking paragraphs—for ordinary details of Church life must be dealt with in ordinary language—we detect a failing of power in comparison with the Paul of the earlier letters: the inspiration is as true, but it is not as strong; the heart and arteries and veins do their duty, but the blood does not course so quickly as in the days of youth. To put it quite plainly: the difficulties that meet the student of the Pastoral Epistles lie rather in the logical connexion of the paragraphs than in the profundity of the thoughts expressed in them; and whatever obscurity there may be in some of the expressions used is due in nearly every case to the meagreness of our information concerning the circumstances of the writer and of the Church.

In the earlier epistles, on the contrary, it often happens that the apostle's thoughts and conceptions are too great for expression. He does not, indeed cannot, formulate them precisely; he gives them the most adequate expression he can; and the Holy Spirit has ever since been leading the Church to a constantly increasing comprehension of them. But in the Pastorals we do not meet any such struggles between thought and language. We are never conscious

that we are present at the birth of some mighty principle which can reach maturity only at the end of time. Great theological statements concerning man's salvation—not of the relation of Christ to the universe—are formulated, not daringly sketched; the conceptions of the mutual relations of God and man which are involved in these statements are not new to the author; he has mastered them completely, and presents them with a finished expression which leaves the reader satisfied. Take, for example, the statement of the wideness of God's saving purposes in 1 Tim. ii. 4-6; the summary of the working out of the Incarnation in 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; the analysis of the saving process in Tit. iii. 4-7. Here we have theological principles in their classical expression; they do not need exegesis, they only demand to be "marked, learned, and inwardly digested".

Again, the apostle, in these letters is not only not creative; he is displayed to us as receptive of the thoughts of other makers of Christian theology, his contemporaries. When St. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, his own work as an originating constructive theologian had come to an end; and there comes into clear view—what had been hitherto veiled—the effect on him of the action of the religious life of the communities in which he lived. It is a truth, obvious when stated, yet sometimes ignored, that the thoughts about religion current in the Christian Society of the first century, had not been generated only by St. Paul, but by St. John and St. Peter and others whose names and achievements we can only conjecture. When we were young, we used to picture the Palestine of the patriarchs as a land in which no person or thing except Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their flocks were of any significance; they dominated the landscape as do the saints in medieval pictures. When we grew older, it was almost disturbing to one's faith to realise that to the busy merchants and peasants of Palestine, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were not persons of unusual importance. Yet, as always happens, the truer account, unpalatable at first, is found to be more suggestive and helpful than the older fancy. In like manner, a realisation that St. Paul did not dominate the Church of his time, as his history in the Acts and his epistles so largely dominate the New Testament, will be found a helpful consideration.

The Church is a greater thing than the greatest saint or theologian in it; and St. Paul could not have helped, even if he would, being influenced by the Christianity, as actually lived, of the men and women around him; and that in three ways at least. (1) His own theology came back to him not quite the same as it had come from his brain. It is not only the elements of matter that are subject to

reaction in consequence of fusion; the same natural law operates in the interaction of the thoughts of a thoughtmaker with the minds of those to whom his thoughts are communicated. And, if we may carry on the same analogy, the Church of St Paul's time was unable to take up, to hold in solution, the whole of the Pauline theology; a considerable amount of it was held in suspension to be absorbed gradually by the Church in the course of the ages. (2) Again, as has just been pointed out, the religious thought of the Christian Society in which St. Paul lived was fed and stirred by other apostles, of whom we can name St. John and St. Peter. It is surely not unreasonable to suppose that these apostles spoke before they wrote, that what they published was the most perfect expression attainable by them of what they had been speaking about during the whole of their ministry; that, in fact, Johannine literature was, for the Church of the first century, the final presentation, not the origination, of Johannine thought and expression. Is it too much to expect that those who study the writings contained in the New Testament should cease to think of the authors of them as solitaries who had no other means but books of acquiring ideas or a vocabulary, and who, in turn, only influenced the thought and phraseology of the men of their time by books or treatises composed at the close of their lives. It is strange that men cannot see the Church, the Society which conditioned, was not conditioned by, St. Paul, St. John and St. Peter. This consideration is intended to prepare the reader to be not astonished or perplexed by the occasional Johannine turns of phrase that occur in the Pastorals, and which are noted in the course of the exposition. (3) Furthermore, it must not be thought strange that the Providence of God, the Holy Spirit Who guides the Church, should have called the apostle Paul almost wholly away from thoughts of the Church's place in history and in the universe to the administration of, and provision for, the daily needs of the Church as actually experienced by man. Our own generation has not been without examples of men summoned from the library of the "great house" into less obviously inspiring chambers, which serve the more material, but not less necessary, needs of the household. Christians who think of the Church as a visible Divine Society with a life on earth continuous to the end of time, cannot think that St. Paul as reflected in the Pastorals is less worthy of admiration than St. Paul as reflected in Romans. Nor will they be offended if they find that his new preoccupation with ordinary Church life has left a trace on his idiom; if, it may be, he has caught some of the current

phrases of ordinary religious society. He is not less intelligible to Timothy, or less truly himself.

The Style of the Letters.

It was noticed in the beginning of this Introduction that the consideration of most weight against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is the style of the composition, which differs from that of any of the groups of the other ten Pauline letters—the genuineness of which is here assumed—by (*a*) the recurrence in them of certain, almost stereotyped, forms of expression, (*b*) by a general difference in the structure of sentences, and (*c*) by the absence from them of alleged characteristic Pauline words. These three sorts of variation are here enumerated in the order of tbeir importance. No fair-minded traditionalist will be disposed to minimise the gravity of the problem presented by these indisputable facts. On the other hand, these acknowledged peculiarities must not be allowed to obscure the equally undoubted fact that the Epistles present not only as many characteristic Pauline words as the writer had use for, but that, in the more significant matter of turns of expression, the style of the letters is, as has been stated before, fundamentally Pauline. This will be evident from an inspection of the references. Perhaps it is true to say that the positive stylistic peculiarities of the letters—the large number of unusual words,[1] the recurrent phraseology—deprive of its just weight the counter argument based on its admittedly Pauline element, just because this is normal, and does not strike the eye. It is at least a strong argument on the traditionalist side, that the un-Pauline style of the Pastorals was not commented on by the early Greek Christian critics, as was the un-Pauline style of Hebrews, and the un-Johannine style of the Apocalypse. On the other hand, the peculiarities of expression are not such as a clever imitator of St. Paul's style would introduce.

Taking up, in the first place, the recurrent words, terms and phrases, it will be convenient to divide them into three categories.

A. Terms, or phrases, of the religious life of the Christian Society.
B. Polemical phraseology in reference to false teaching.
C. Favourite terms, or expressions, of the author's.

It is not pretended that this classification can be carried out consistently; but it seemed to be worth attempting. In particular it

[1] Dean Bernard, *Past. Epp.*, p. xxxvi., notes that the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα amount to 176, a number "proportionately twice as great as in any other of St. Paul's letters."

may deserve consideration whether we have not presented to us, in the style of the Pastorals, a new, but not the less true, aspect of St. Paul as a writer, no longer creating a Christian terminology, but freely making use of the phraseology he heard around him, towards the formation of which he had been a principal, but not the only, contributor. On the other hand, in so far as this supposition is true it precludes our making use of the occurrence of certain phrases and words in extant early writings, as proofs that the authors of those writings had read the Pastoral Epistles.

In the following list of terms and phrases, a = 1 Timothy; b = 2 Timothy; c = Titus; the numbers indicate the number of occurrences of the term or phrase in the epistle. When the term or phrase is not peculiar to the Pastorals, a reference is given to its occurrence elsewhere, or "etc." is added.

Terminology of the Christian Society.

a, b, c.

ἡ ἀλήθεια, in a technical sense: a, 3; b, 4; c (2 Cor. iv. 2, etc.).

ἡ διδασκαλία: A, The body of doctrine; absolutely, or with epithets (see ὑγιαίνουσα): a, 4; b, 2; c, 3.

ἡ διδασκαλία: B, The act of teaching: a, 3; b, c (Rom. xii. 7).

ἡ πίστις, *fides quae creditur*: a, 8; b, 2; c, 3.

πίστις [κ.] ἀγάπη: a, 4; b, 2; c (1 Thess. iii. 6, v. 8).

πίστις, ἀγάπη, ὑπομονή: a, [b], c.

ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία: a, b, c, 2. ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι: a, b. ὑγιαίνειν τῇ πίστει: c, 2. λόγος ὑγιής: c. *Cf.* νοσῶν: a; γάγγραινα: b.

ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας and ἐπιγινώσκειν τ. ἀληθείαν: a, 2; b, 2; c (Heb. x. 26; *cf.* Philem. 6).

[ἡ] εὐσέβεια: a, 7; b. κατ' εὐσέβειαν: a, c. εὐσεβῶς ζῆν: b, c. εὐσεβεῖν: a (Acts, 4; 2 Pet. 5).

σώφρων: a, c, 3. σωφρονεῖν: c (Mark v. 15; Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 13). σωφρονισμός: b. σωφρονίζειν: c. σωφρόνως: c. σωφροσύνη: a, 2 (Acts xxvi. 25).

ὁ νῦν αἰών: a, b, c.

ἐπιφάνεια: a, b, 3; c (2 Thess. ii. 8) (ἐπιφαίνειν: c, 2; Luke i. 79; Acts xxvii. 20; *cf.* Acts ii. 20).

ὠφέλιμος: a, 2; b, c.

διάβολοι, adj.: a, b, c.

ἀρνεῖσθαι: a, b, 4; c, 2, etc., but not Paul.

a, b.

συνείδησις καθαρά: a, b (συνείδ. ἀγαθή: a, 2; Acts xxiii. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 16, 21).

καθαρὰ καρδία: a, b.
πίστις ἀνυπόκριτος: a, b.
πίστις κ. ἀγάπη ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: a, b.
πίστις ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: a, b; etc.
καλός: qualifying adj. (not incl. καλὸν ἔργον): a, 9; b, 3 (esp. καλὴ στρατεία, a, or στρατιώτης, b, καλὸς ἀγών, a, b); etc., but not Paul.
παγὶς: a; τοῦ διαβόλου: a, b.
φεῦγε· δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην . . . πίστιν ἀγάπην: a, b.
ἀγωνίζομαι τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα: a, b.
παραθήκην φυλάσσειν: a, b, 2.
παρακολουθεῖν διδασκαλίᾳ: a, b.
ἄνθρωπος [τ.] Θεοῦ: a, b.

a, c.

καλὸν ἔργον, καλὰ ἔργα: a, 4; c, 4; etc., but not Paul.
σεμνός: a, 2; c (Phil. iv. 8); or σεμνότης: a, 2; c.
σωτήρ (of God the Father, not incl. Tit. ii. 13): a, 3; c, 3.

b, c.

εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον: b.
πρὸς ,, ,, ,, ἐξηρτισμένος: b.
,, ,, ,, ,, ἀδόκιμοι: c.
,, ,, ,, ,, ἑτοίμους: c.

Peculiar to *one* Letter.

ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ: a, 2.
μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ: a, 2 (ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή: a,).
ἐπιλαβέσθαι τῆς ζωῆς: a, 2.
μακάριος (of God): a, 2.
τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως, or τῆς εὐσεβείας: a, 2.
πίστις κ. ἀγάπη κ. ἁγιασμός, or ἁγνεία: a, 2.
ἐπαισχύνεσθαι τί or τινά: b, 3 (Rom. i. 16, and five other ins.).
ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα (Last Day): b, 3 (Matt. 2; Luke, 3; 2 Thess. 1).
καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι: c, 2.

Polemical Phraseology.

ἀληθεία: ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας: a. περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν: b. μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας: b. μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθ. ἐλθεῖν δυνάμενα: b. ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ: b. ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τ. ἀκοὴν ἀποστρέψουσιν: b. ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν: c.

νοῦς: διεφθαρμένων . . . τ. νοῦν: a. κατεφθαρμένοι τ. νοῦν: b. μεμίανται αὐτῶν . . . ὁ νοῦς: c.

πίστις: περὶ τ. πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν: a. περὶ τ. πίστιν ἠστόχησαν: a. ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τ. πίστιν: b. ἀποστήσονταί τινες τ. πίστεως: a. ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τ. πίστεως: a. *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 5, 19.

συνείδησις: κεκαυστηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν: a. μεμίανται αὐτῶν . . . ἡ συνείδησις: c. *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 5, 19.

ἀστοχεῖν: a, 2; b. See ἀλήθεια and πίστις.

ἀνατρέπουσιν τήν τινων πίστιν: b. ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν: c. *Cf.* ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων, b.

βέβηλος: a, 3; b (Heb. xii. 16). (βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι: a, b).

γενεαλογίαι: a, c.

ἐκζητήσεις or ζητήσεις: a, 2; b, c. (μωραὶ ζητήσεις: b, c.)

λογομαχεῖν and λογομαχία: a, b.

ματαιολογία and ματαιολόγος: a, c. *Cf.* ζητήσεις . . . μάταιοι, c.

ἔρις: a, c.

μάχη: b, c.

μῦθος: a, 2; b, c (2 Pet. i. 16).

νόμος: a, 2; νομικός: c; νομοδιδάσκαλος: a.

ἐπὶ πλεῖον προκόψουσιν ἀσεβείας: b. οὐ προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον: b. προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον: b.

Author's Favourite Terms.

a, b, c.

πιστὸς ὁ λόγος: a, b, c.

πιστὸς ὁ λόγος κ. πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος: a, 2.

παραιτοῦ: a, 2; b, c.

οἶκος (household): a, 5; b, 2; c (1 Cor. i. 16, etc.).

περί with accusative: a, 3; b, 2; c (Phil. ii. 23, etc.).

a, b.

χάριν ἔχω; a, b (Luke xvii. 9; Heb. xii. 28).

διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ, or τ. Κυρίου: a; b, 2.

εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κῆρυξ κ. ἀπόστολος . . . διδάσκαλος: a, b.

χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη: a, b.

ὧν ἐστίν: a; b, 2.

a, c.

ὡσαύτως: a, 4; c, 2.

ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ: a, c.

καιροῖς ἰδίοις: a, 2; c.

διαβεβαιοῦσθαι περί τινος: a, c.

προσέχειν: a, 5; c. (προσέχειν μύθοις: a, c.)

b, c.

σπούδασον: b, 3; c. (σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν: b, 2; c.)
περιΐστασο: b, c.
δι' ἣν αἰτίαν: b, 2; c (Luke viii. 47; Acts xxii. 24; Heb. ii. 11).

b.

συνκακοπάθησον: b, 2.

The second difference in style by which the Pastoral Epistles are marked off from the earlier letters may be given in the words of Lightfoot.

The Syntax.

(*a*) "It is stiffer and more regular than in the earlier Epistles, more jointed and less flowing. The clauses are marshalled together, and there is a tendency to parallelism."

e.g., 1 Tim. i. 9, ii. 1, 2, iii. 16, iv. 12, 13, 15, v. 10, vi. 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18; 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12, iii. 1-8, 10-13, 16, iv. 2, 4, 5, 7; Tit. i. 7, 8, 9, ii. 7, 12, iii. 1-3.

(*b*) "There is a greater sententiousness, an abruptness and positiveness of form. Imperative clauses are frequent.

e.g., 1 Tim. iv. 11, 15, 16, v. 7, 8, 22-25, vi. 2, 6, 11, 20; 2 Tim. i. 13, 14, ii. 1, 3, 7, 8, 14, 19, 22, 23, iii. 1, 5, 12, 16."

(*Biblical Essays*, p. 402.)

These differences in syntax are not unconnected with the small variety and paucity of particles which are a negative feature of the Pastorals. But neither characteristic is very astonishing, since in point of fact, the Epistles are of the nature of episcopal charges, authoritative, not argumentative; enforcing disciplinary regulations, not unfolding theological conceptions, or vindicating personal claims.

We come, in the last place, to state and consider the problem presented by the purely negative characteristic of the style of the Pastoral Epistles, the fact that we do not find in them certain alleged characteristic Pauline words. Those who urge this as a serious argument against the traditional belief as to the authorship of these letters do not seem to make allowance for the fact that they are *ex hypothesi* dealing with a real man—not a machine; a man who had travelled much, and had read much; who was constantly coming into contact with fresh people, constantly confronted with fresh problems of practical life. The vocabulary of such a man is not likely to remain unaffected in its contents or use. Add to this,

that each of the other letters which are ascribed to him arose out of special circumstances, and deals almost exclusively with those special circumstances, and that the circumstances which called forth the letters to Timothy and Titus were, confessedly, quite different from those out of which any of the other Pauline letters arose. When these obvious facts are considered, it is difficult to treat seriously an argument which assumes that St. Paul was provided with only one set of words and terms; unalterable, no matter to whom, or on what subject, he was writing.

It is not thus that non-Biblical compositions are critically examined. We do not demand that Shakespeare's *Sonnets* or *Cymbeline* should exhibit a certain percentage of *Hamlet* words. And the argument becomes all the more unreasonable when one thinks how very small in extent is the extant literary work of St. Paul: less than 150 small octavo pages in Westcott and Hort's edition, and of these the Pastorals occupy only fifteen. If we had been privileged to hear St. Paul's sermons, or to listen to his conversation, how many Pauline words, as shown in a concordance, should we have heard?

Antecedently, we should not expect that an author's favourite expressions would be distributed over the pages of his book like the spots on a wall-paper pattern; nor is this notion confirmed when we examine the list of Pauline words missing from the Pastorals, as given by Holtzmann (*Pastoralbriefe*, p. 98, *sqq.*) and less fully by von Soden (*Hand-Commentar*, p. 177 *sqq.*).

In the complete list of verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs, fifty in all, as printed below, each group of cognate words, bracketed together, is for argument's sake, treated as a unit. And the numbers indicate the number of times the word occurs in St. Paul's Epistles. The words that are spaced are those, which after an examination of a concordance, can be plausibly claimed as characteristically Pauline; that is to say, they are of comparative frequent occurrence, and are found in at least three groups of his Epistles. It must be allowed that the absence of all of these is surprising. The simplest explanation is that some of them had passed out of St. Paul's ordinary vocabulary; and that, in the case of others, the subject matter of the Pastorals did not demand their use. Some of them, obviously, belong to the vocabulary of certain theological conceptions, others to that of a writer's temperament and temper.

For the purpose of analysis, it will be convenient to think of the other ten epistles of St. Paul as falling into four groups, *viz.*:—

(i.) 1 and 2 Thessalonians.

(ii.) Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Gal.

(iii.) Eph., Col., Philem.

(iv.) Philippians, which though it is one of group iii., as being one of the epistles of the first Roman captivity, yet inasmuch as it was written somewhat later, may be considered apart.

ἄδικος, 3, ἀκαθαρσία, 9, ἀκροβυστία, 19, (ἀποκαλύπτειν, 13, ἀποκάλυψις, 13), ἀπολύτρωσις, 7, γνωρίζειν, 18, διαθήκη, 9 (δικαιοῦν, 27, δικαίωμα, 5), δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, 9, δοκεῖν, 18, ἕκαστος, 42, (ἐλευθερία, 7, ἐλεύθερος, 16, ἐλευθεροῦν, 5), (ἐνέργεια, 8, ἐνεργεῖν, 17, ἐνέργημα, 2, ἐνεργής, 2), ἔξεστιν, 5, ἔργα νόμου, 9, κἀγώ, 27, καταργεῖν, 25, κατεργάζεσθαι, 20, (καυχᾶσθαι, 35, καύχημα, 10, καύχησις, 10), κρείσσων, 4, μείζων, 4, μικρός, 4, μωρία, 5, (ὁμοιοῦν, 1, ὁμοίωμα, 5), ὁμοίως, 4, ὁρᾶν, 10, οὐρανός, 21, παράδοσις, 5, παραλαμβάνειν, 11, πατὴρ ἡμῶν, 7, outside salutations, πείθειν, 2, (περισσεία, 3, περισσεύειν, 26, περίσσευμα, 2, περισσός, 2, περισσότερος, 6), περιπατεῖν, 32, (πεποιθέναι, 12, πεποίθησις, 6), πλεονάζειν, 8, (πλεονεκτεῖν, 5, πλεονέκτης, 4, πλεονεξία, 6), οἱ πολλοί, 8, (πρᾶγμα, 4, πρᾶξις, 3, πράσσειν, 18), σπλάγχνα, 8, (συνεργεῖν, 3, συνεργός, 12), σῶμα, 91, (ταπεινός, 3, ταπεινοῦν, 4), (τέλειος, 8, τελειότης, 1, τελειοῦν, 1), υἱοθεσία, 5, υἱὸς τ. Θεοῦ, 17, (ὑπακοή, 11, ὑπακούειν, 11), (φρονεῖν, 24, φρόνημα, 4, φρόνησις, 1, φρόνιμος, 5), φύσις, 11, χαρίζεσθαι, 16, χρηστός, 3.

Of the fifty characteristically Pauline words no less than eleven do not occur in groups i., iii., iv., *viz.*, ἄδικος, δικαιοῦν, δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, ἔξεστιν, ἔργα νόμου, μείζων, μικρός, μωρία, ὁμοίως, πείθειν, οἱ πολλοί. Of these, ἄδικος is not found in 2 Cor. or Gal.; δικαιοῦν not in 2 Cor. though twice in the Pastorals; while δικαίωμα only occurs in Rom.; δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ not in 1 Cor. or Gal.; ἔξεστιν not in Rom. or Gal.; ἔργα νόμου not in 1 Cor. or 2 Cor.; μείζων not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; μικρός not in Rom.; μωρία only in 1 Cor. (while μωρός, also in 1 Cor. (4), occurs in the Pastorals twice); ὁμοίως not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; πείθειν not in Rom. or 1 Cor.; οἱ πολλοί not in Gal., but five times in Rom. It is obvious, from these facts, that these eleven words are not characteristically Pauline.

Of the others, four do not occur in groups i. and iii., *viz.*, δοκεῖν, κρείσσων, ὁμοιοῦν, ταπεινός. Of these, δοκεῖν not in Rom.; κρείσσων not in Rom., 2 Cor. or Gal.; ὁμοιοῦν not in 1 Cor., 2 Cor. or Gal.; and ταπεινός not in 1 Cor. or Gal.

Seven do not occur in groups i. and iv., *viz.*, ἀκροβυστία, ἀπολύτρωσις, διαθήκη, ἐλευθερία, υἱοθεσία, φύσις, χρηστός. Of these, ἀκροβυστία not in 2 Cor.; ἀπολύτρωσις not in 2 Cor. or Gal. Of the ἐλευθερία

group, ἐλεύθερος and ἐλευθεροῦν are not in 2 Cor., and ἐλευθεροῦν is not in 1 Cor. υἱοθεσία not in 1 Cor. or 2 Cor.; φύσις not in 2 Cor.; χρηστός not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; leaving διαθήκη (once in iii.) and ἐλευθερία (twice in iii.) as the only words that are evenly distributed in group ii.

Among those which do not occur in group i., *viz.*, γνωρίζειν, κατεργάζεσθαι, σπλάγχνα, τέλειος, φρονεῖν, χαρίζεσθαι, we notice that of the twenty instances of κατεργάζεσθαι seventeen occur in Rom. and 2 Cor.; σπλάγχνα, not found in Rom., 1 Cor. or Gal., occurs three times in Philem.; none of the τέλειος group is found in 2 Cor. or Gal., while τελειοῦν and τελειότης are absent from Rom. and 1 Cor. Of the thirty-four instances of the φρονεῖν group, one of which is 1 Tim. vi. 17, Rom. and Phil. account for twenty-five; φρόνημα is only found in Rom., φρόνησις only in Eph., φρόνιμος only in Rom., 1 Cor., and 2 Cor.; leaving γνωρίζειν and χαρίζεσθαι fairly representative words.

It remains to notice a few of these characteristically Pauline words which are not found in Philippians, *viz.*: ἀκαθαρσία, καταργεῖν, ὁρᾶν, παράδοσις, πλεονεκτεῖν, and υἱὸς τ. Θεοῦ. ἀκαθαρσία is not found in 1 Cor.; καταργεῖν does, in point of fact, occur in 2 Tim.; ὁρᾶν, found in 1 Tim. iii. 16, does not occur in 2 Cor. or Gal., παράδοσις not in Rom. or 2 Cor.; none of the πλεονεκτεῖν group is found in Gal., while πλεονεκτεῖν and πλεονεξία are both absent from 1 Cor., and πλεονέκτης from 2 Cor. Of the seventeen places where our Lord is called υἱὸς [τ. Θεοῦ,] eleven are found in Rom. and Gal.

In the whole list, then, there are twenty-seven words, or more than half, the absence of which from the Pastorals obviously need call for no remark. The following facts with regard to the distribution of some of the others are suggestive; and diminish, if they do not wholly remove, the difficulty of the problem before us. ἕκαστος (42) occurs twenty-two times in 1 Cor.; of the ἐνέργεια group (29) three members are not found in Rom., 2 Cor., or Gal., *i.e.*, ἐνέργεια, ἐνέργημα, ἐνεργής; neither is ἐνέργεια found in 1 Cor. Of the twenty-seven occurrences of κἀγώ, more than half, nineteen, are found in 1 Cor. and 2 Cor. Of the καυχᾶσθαι group (55) more than half, twenty-nine, occur in 2 Cor; παραλαμβάνειν (11) is not found in Rom. or 2 Cor. πατὴρ ἡμῶν, apart from its common use in salutations, is found three times in 1 Thess., twice in 2 Thess., and once each in Gal. and Phil. Of the περισσεία group (39), none is found in Gal.; three not in 1 Cor., *i.e.*, περισσεία, περισσός and περίσσευμα; two not in Rom., *i.e.*, περίσσευμα and περισσότερος. On the other hand, nearly half, seventeen, of the total is found in 2 Cor. (which has also περισσο-

τέρως seven times), seven occur in 1 Cor. and five in Phil. Neither πεποιθέναι nor πεποίθησις occurs in 1 Cor.; πεποίθησις not in Rom. or Gal. Here again seven cases belong to 2 Cor. and seven to Phil. Of the πρᾶγμα group (25), thirteen belong to Rom., which has ten out of the eighteen occurrences of πράσσειν. Neither of the συνεργεῖν group (15) occurs in Gal.; yet its distribution is otherwise fairly even. The distribution of σῶμα (91) is remarkable. Just more than half, forty-six, of its occurrences are found in 1 Cor.; chap. vi. having eight, chap. xii., eighteen, chap. xv., nine. Neither ὑπακοή nor ὑπακούειν occur in 1 Cor. or Gal.; ὑπακούειν not in 2 Cor.

An analysis of the list of Pauline particles that are not found in the Pastoral Epistles yields the same general result; that is to say, the great majority of them are confined to group ii. of the Epistles; and that is explained by the fact that that group is the most argumentative and controversial, and the subject matter demands the employment of inferential and similar particles. Thus ἄρα (15), ἕνεκεν (6), ἴδε (1) ἰδού (9, of which 6 are in 2 Cor.), ποῦ (10, 8 of which are in 1 Cor.), παρά, acc. (14), are not found outside group ii.; ἔπειτα (11, 7 of which are in 1 Cor.), μήπως (10), οὔτε (34, of which 22 are in 4 verses), are only in group ii. and in 1 Thess. The following also do not occur in groups i and iii: ἄχρι (ii. 12, iv. 2), οὔπω (ii. 2, iv. 1) πάλιν (ii. 25, iv. 3). The following do not occur in group iii. διότι (10: i. 3, ii. 6, iv. 1), ἔμπροσθεν (7: i. 4, ii. 2, iv. 1), ἔτι (15: i. 1, ii. 13, iv. 1). The distribution of the others is as follows: ἀντί (5: i, 2, ii. 2, iii. 1), ἄρα οὖν (12: i. 2, ii. 9, iii, 1), διό (27, i. 2, ii. 18, iii. 6, iv. 1), ὅπως (9: i. 1, ii. 7, iii. 1), οὐκέτι (15: ii. 13, iii. 2), ἐν παντί (16: i. 1, ii. 11, of which 10 are in 2 Cor.; iii. 2, iv. 2), ποτέ (does occur in Tit., otherwise 19: i. 1, ii. 8, iii. 9, iv. 1), ὥσπερ (14: i. 1 ii. 13), σύν (38: i. 4, ii. 21, iii. 9, iv. 4). There are twenty-four characteristically Pauline particles in the above enumeration. Of these, ten are not found in group i., fifteen are not found in group iii., and in fact, in the epistles of the first Roman captivity (groups iii. and iv.), which are about half as long again as the Pastoral Epistles, particles are very sparingly used; διό, ἐν παντί and σύν alone being at all common. It may be proper to note here in connexion with the absence of σύν from the Pastorals, that twice, in 2 Tim. iv. 11 and Tit. iii. 15, μετά is used where the other Pauline letters have σύν; otherwise the usage of μετά in the Pastorals does not differ from that of St. Paul elsewhere. Another noteworthy feature in the Pastorals is the absence of the article, especially before common Christian terms. This peculiarity, and also the deficiency in particles, may be possibly due to the amanuensis employed by St. Paul at this

time. See Dean Bernard, *Past. Epp.* p. xli., and Milligan, *Thessalonians*, p. 126.

Historical Setting of the Epistles.

It is altogether unneccessary for any one now to restate the arguments which prove that the references to persons and places in the Pastorals cannot be accommodated to the history of St. Paul and of his companions as given in the Acts. The "historical contradictions" are marshalled with crushing force by Lightfoot in his *Biblical Essays*, p. 403 *sqq.* Critics of the anti-traditional school who accept, as genuine Pauline fragments, those sections of the Pastorals in which the personal and local references occur are obliged to allocate these references to different parts of the Acts; and, even so, the explanations given are forced and unconvincing. It must then be clearly understood that our claim of the Pastorals for St. Paul is based on the assumption that his ministry was prolonged for at least two years beyond the date of the close of the Acts. If St. Paul was martyred immediately, or very soon, after the expiration of the two years' confinement mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30, then he did not write the Pastoral Epistles or any portion of them. This is a vital point; and demands at least a brief discussion of the main arguments in favour of the traditional opinion. Supposing that the Pastorals were not in our hands, and the question were asked, Was the two years' confinement in Rome mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30, followed by St. Paul's execution, or by his release?—the answer must be that all the *positive* evidence available is in favour of the latter alternative. There are three lines of argument: (1) the way in which the Acts ends; (2) the evidence of the epistles written during, or towards the end, of those two years; (3) external testimony.

(1) It ought to be unnecessary to observe that the author of the Acts knew what happened at the end of those two years. We can only guess why he stopped where he did; yet some guesses have more probability than others. There were limits to the size of books in those days. On the supposition that St. Luke knew of a subsequent ministry of his master's, the close of the Roman captivity would be a suitable point at which to bring vol. i. of the Acts to a conclusion, whether regard be had to considerations of space, or of literary fitness; the arrival at Rome being the fulfilment of the apostle's intention announced in Acts xix. 21. On the other hand, if St. Luke knew that St. Paul's two years' confinement had been followed at once by his execution, the historian's omission to mention

it cannot be accounted for. A brief record would have been all that was necessary, and this would not have added unduly to the length of the book.

Salmon's explanation (*Introduction*, p. 312) that "why St. Luke has told us no more is, that he knew no more; and that he knew no more, because at the time nothing more had happened—in other words, that the book of the Acts was written a little more than two years after Paul's arrival at Rome," will not commend itself to many scholars. It seems more natural to suppose that both the Gospel and the Acts were published after St. Paul's death. Literary men do not always succeed in completing their designs before they die; and the later the date we assign to Acts, the greater is the probability that St. Luke died before he had reduced to literary form his memories of the Apostle's post-Roman-captivity history.

Passing now to an examination on this point of the third group of St. Paul's Epistles, the evidence afforded by them is distinctly favourable to the supposition that St. Paul was released after the two years of Acts xxviii. 30. We must of course avoid the error into which some fall, of imagining that every foreboding or declared intention recorded in a narrative, or preserved in a published letter, would have been suppressed by the editor if it had not been realised. And accordingly we can only infer from the tone of Philippians and Philemon that, in St. Paul's judgment, when he wrote these letters, the prospect of his release was favourable. No other inference can be drawn from "I know that I shall abide, yea, and abide with you all, for your progress and joy in the faith" (Phil. i. 25); "I trust in the Lord that I myself also shall come shortly" (ii. 24); "Prepare me also a lodging: for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you" (Philem. 22). Contrast with these passages the tone of 2 Timothy, which is that of a man who knew that his days were numbered, and that the end was not far off.

What seems to be a natural conclusion from the internal evidence of Acts xxviii. and of Philippians and Philemon is confirmed by the tradition of the early Church as it is expressed by Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii., 22: "Paul is said (λόγος ἔχει), after having defended himself to have set forth again upon the ministry of preaching, and to have entered the same city a second time, and to have there ended his life by martyrdom. Whilst then a prisoner, he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy, in which he both mentions his first defence, and his impending death." It is to be noted that there is no contrary tradition; nor is it easy to see what end could have been served by the invention of this one.

There are two passages in earlier writers which are adduced as proof that St. Paul at one time visited Spain. Since it is impossible to find room for such a journey within the period covered by the Acts, these passages, if accepted as proofs of the expedition to Spain, are therefore proofs of a missionary activity of St. Paul subsequent to the date of the close of the Acts. In the Letter of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, § 5, the writer speaks of Peter and Paul as contemporary martyrs; and Paul he describes as κῆρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει . . . δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών.

It is difficult to believe that a native of Rome, writing from Rome, would speak of the world's capital as ἡ δύσις or τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως; nor did Corinth lie so far to the east of Rome as to justify such a rhetorical expression (see Lightfoot's note *in loc.*). Nor can we argue from the opening of the following chapter—"Unto these men of holy lives was gathered (συνηθροίσθη) a vast multitude"—that Clement meant to date the fury of Neronic persecution as subsequent to the martyrdom of St. Paul. Writing about thirty years after "the great tribulation," he mentions the martyrs in order of dignity. In any case, he mentions Peter's death before that of Paul; yet this was never considered an argument against the tradition that the two apostles were martyred together; nor would it be felt as a serious objection to the recent theory that St. Peter outlived St. Paul by many years.

The following passage from the Muratorian Canon, in its obscure simplicity, reads like a fragment of a genuine tradition rather than a literary figment based on Rom. xv. 28: "Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt. Lucas optime Theophilo comprendit, quia sub praesentia eius singula gerebantur, sicuti et semote passionem [*perh.* semota passione] Petri euidenter declarat, sed et *profectionem* [*perh.* profectione] *Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis*" (text as given by Westcott, *Canon. N.T.*, p. 535). The argument is unaffected even if the words from "passionem" be derived from the early second century *Actus Petri cum Simone*. See James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, ii., xi., and Dean Bernard, *Pastoral Epp.*, p. xxx. These considerations force us to the conclusion that the assumption that St. Paul's life ended where St. Luke's history terminates is arbitrary, and contrary to the evidence that is available. It remains to present to the reader a conjectural outline (based on Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, p. 223) of St. Paul's movements between his release and his second Roman imprisonment.

(1) A journey from Rome to Asia Minor. It is natural to suppose

that he visited Philippi and Colossæ, in accordance with the intimations cited above from Phil. and Philem. Perhaps he now visited Crete.

(2) A journey to Spain; perhaps passing through Dalmatia and Gaul (?) (2 Tim. iv. 10). Possibly on this journey he became aware of the convenience of Nicopolis in Epirus as a centre for work.

(3) Last journey Eastward. Visits Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3). The dispute with Hymenæus and Alexander the smith, and the services of Onesiphorus (1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14) perhaps now took place. Leaves Timothy in charge of the Church at Ephesus. Visits Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3).

[1 Timothy.]

Visits Crete; leaves Titus in charge; returns to Asia (as hoped in 1 Tim. iii. 14, iv. 13).

[Titus.]

Passes through Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20), Troas (2 Tim. iv. 13), where perhaps he was arrested, Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20). In any case he never reached Nicopolis as anticipated in Tit. iii. 12. It is here assumed that the winter mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 21, is the same as that of Tit. iii. 12.

[2 Timothy.]

External Evidence.

With regard to the external attestation to the Pastoral Epistles, it must be acknowledged that some early heretics, who acknowledged the genuineness of the other letters attributed to St. Paul, rejected these. Basilides, who flourished in the reign of Hadrian (117-138 A.D.), is the first who is said to have done so. Clement Al. (*Strom.* ii. 11) states that some, Gnostics apparently, were actuated in this decision by dislike of the expression ἡ ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις in 1 Tim. vi. 20: ὑπὸ ταύτης ἐλεγχόμενοι τῆς φωνῆς οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων τὰς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἀθετοῦσιν ἐπιστολάς. On the other hand, the extant fragments of another Gnostic, Heracleon, contain an allusion to 2 Tim. ii. 13: ἀρνήσασθαι ἑαυτὸν οὐδέποτε δύναται (Clem. Al., *Strom.* iv. 9). The Canon of Marcion, which contained only his own edition of the Gospel according to St. Luke and ten of St. Paul's epistles, of course did not include the Pastorals; but Tatian (died about 170) did not wholly follow him in this, since he regarded Titus as certainly genuine. "Hanc vel maxime Apostoli pronuntiandam credidit, parvi pendens Marcionis, et aliorum qui cum eo in hac parte consentiunt, assertionem" (Jerome, *Prol. in Tit.*). In the same context, St.

Jerome declares that these adverse judgments were not critical in any true sense, but merely arbitrary: "cum haeretica auctoritate pronuntient et dicant, Illa epistola Pauli est, haec non est". However that may be, there is at least no trace in the writings of the Church controversialists of arguments of a critical nature; whereas in the dispute as to the authorship of Hebrews, Clement Al. and Origen were compelled to discuss the problem presented by its un-Pauline style. In any case, the fact that the rejection of the Pastorals by some heretics was noted amounts to a positive testimony in their favour by the contemporary Church.

From the time of Irenæus, Clement Al. and Tertullian[1]—that is, practically from the time that N.T. books are quoted by their author's names—until the year 1804, when Schmidt in his *Introduction* denied the genuineness of 1 Timothy, no one, Christian or non-Christian, doubted that the Pastoral Epistles were genuine letters of the Apostle Paul. They are included in all MSS., Versions and Lists of the Pauline Epistles without exception, and in the same order (*i.e.*, 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit.). An interesting exception as regards the order meets us in the Muratorian Fragment: "Uerum ad Philemonem unam, et ad Titum unam, et ad Timotheum duas pro affectu et dilectione; in honore tamen ecclesiae catholicae in ordinatione ecclesiasticae disciplinae sanctificatae sunt". The composer of this catalogue here arranges the groups of four personal letters of St. Paul in rough chronological order. As 2 Tim. was obviously the last letter that St. Paul wrote, the two to Timothy are placed last, Titus being joined to them as evidently dealing with kindred topics.

It remains that the reader should have placed before him the traces, more or less distinct, of the Pastoral Epistles in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and of the pre-Irenæus period.

Clement of Rome. *Ad Cor.* 1. (A.D. 95.)

§ 1 (1 Tim. vi. 1). ὥστε τὸ . . . ὄνομα ὑμῶν μεγάλως βλασφημηθῆναι.

§ 1 (1 Tim. v. 17). τιμὴν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς . . . πρεσβυτέροις.

§ 1 (1 Tim. ii. 9, 11; Tit. ii. 4). γυναιξίν . . . στεργούσας καθηκόντως τοὺς ἄνδρας ἑαυτῶν ἔν τε τῷ κανόνι τῆς ὑποταγῆς ὑπαρχούσας τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον σεμνῶς οἰκουργεῖν ἐδιδάσκετε, πάνυ σωφρονούσας.

[1] *e.g.*, Irenæus, *Haer.* Praef.; i. 16, 3; ii. 14, 7; iii. 3, 3; iii. 3, 4; iv. 16, 3. Clem. Al., *Strom.* i. p. 350. Tert., *de Praescr.* 6, 25. *Adv. Marcion.* v. 21.

§ 2 (1 Tim. vi. 8). τοῖς ἐφοδίοις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρκούμενοι.

* § 2 (Tit. iii. 1). ἕτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν.

§ 7 (1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). ὁ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ἀγὼν ἐπίκειται.

§ 7 (1 Tim. ii. 3, v. 4). ἴδωμεν . . . τὶ προσδεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς.

* § 26 (Tit. ii. 10). αὐτῷ δουλευσάντων ἐν πεποιθήσει πίστεως ἀγαθῆς.

§ 29 (1 Tim. ii. 8). προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν.

* § 32 (Tit. iii. 5-7). πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν . . . οὐ δι' αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἢ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ.

* § 37 (1 Tim. i. 18). στρατευσώμεθα οὖν . . . ἐν τοῖς ἀμώμοις προστάγμασιν αὐτοῦ.

§ 42 (1 Tim. iii. 10). καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους.

* § 45 (2 Tim. i. 3). τῶν ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει λατρευόντων.

§ 47 (1 Tim. vi. 1). ὥστε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρεσθαι τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου.

§ 55 (2 Tim. ii. 1). γυναῖκες ἐνδυναμωθεῖσαι διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

§ 55 (1 Tim. i. 17). Θεὸν τῶν αἰώνων.

§ 61 (1 Tim. i. 17). βασιλεῦ τῶν αἰώνων.

To these we may add, perhaps, the prayer for Kings in §§ 60, 61, in conformity with the direction given in 1 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. iii. 2, and in those places only of the N.T.

On a review of these passages, it must in candour be admitted that those marked with an asterisk seem to be the only ones that suggest a literary dependence on the Pastorals. The others, it may be plausibly maintained, are simply illustrations of that current religious phraseology which the Pastorals themselves reflect. Taken all together, they prove that Clement's mind was at home in the religious world to which the Pastorals belong; but while the present writer believes that Clement was as familiar with these letters as he was with 1 Cor., he cannot affirm such a position to be wholly free from uncertainty.

Ignatius (*circ.* A.D. 110).

* *Magn.* § 8 (Tit. i. 14, iii. 9). μὴ πλανᾶσθε ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφελέσιν οὖσιν· εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι.

§ 11 (1 Tim. i. 1). πεπληροφόρησθε ἐν τῇ γεννήσει κ. τ. πάθει κ. τ. ἀναστάσει τῇ γενομένῃ ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου· πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς κ. βεβαίως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν.

Trall. Inscr. and § 2 have also *Jesus Christ our hope.*

Polyc. § 2 (2 Tim. ii. 25). τοὺς λοιμοτέρους ἐν πραΰτητι ὑπότασσε.

*§ 2 (2 Tim. iv. 5; ii. 5; i. 10; i. 5, 12). νῆφε, ὡς Θεοῦ ἀθλητής· τὸ θέμα ἀφθαρσία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, περὶ ἧς καὶ σὺ πέπεισαι.

§ 3 (1 Tim. i. 3, vi. 3). ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες μή σε καταπλησσέτωσαν.

*§ 3 (2 Tim. ii. 12). ἕνεκεν Θεοῦ πάντα ὑπομένειν ἡμᾶς δεῖ, ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὑπομείνῃ.

§ 3 (1 Tim. i. 17). τὸν ἀόρατον.

*§ 4 (1 Tim. vi. 1, 2). δούλους καὶ δούλας μὴ ὑπερηφάνει· ἀλλὰ μηδὲ αὐτοὶ φυσιούσθωσαν, ἀλλ' εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πλέον δουλευέτωσαν.

*§ 6 (2 Tim. ii. 4). ἀρέσκετε ᾧ στρατεύεσθε, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὰ ὀψώνια κομίζεσθε.

§ 7 (Tit. iii. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 21). ἕτοιμοί ἐστε εἰς εὐποιΐαν Θεῷ ἀνήκουσαν.

The echoes of the Pastorals are especially remarkable in the Epistle to Polycarp; and it is peculiarly worthy of remark that in this letter, which was admittedly a personal communication from Ignatius to Polycarp, the writer passes from exhortations to Polycarp himself—and those too of a very delicate nature—to general exhortations addressed to the whole Church. Contrast *e.g.* § 5 with § 6; and in the middle of a section addressed to the whole Church he interposes a personal appeal to Polycarp. This illustrates admirably a feature in the Pastorals which has been alleged as a serious objection to their acceptation as genuine letters; *i.e.* the intermingling of personal matter with directions and exhortations addressed to the Church.

POLYCARP. *Ad Phil.* (*circ.* A.D. 110).

*§ 4 (1 Tim. vi. 10, 7). ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία. εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν.

§ 5 (2 Tim. ii. 12). ἐὰν πολιτευσώμεθα ἀξίως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν αὐτῷ.

§ 8 (1 Tim. i. 1). προσκαρτερῶμεν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν . . . ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς.

* § 9 (2 Tim. iv. 10). οὐ γὰρ τὸν νῦν ἠγάπησαν αἰῶνα.

* § 12 (1 Tim. ii. 2, iv. 15). *Orate* etiam *pro regibus et potestatibus et principibus* . . . ut fructus vester *manifestus sit in omnibus.*

The Acts of Martyrdom of Polycarp (A.D. 155 or 156).

§ 10 (1 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. iii. 1). δεδιδάγμεθα γὰρ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναις τιμὴν . . . ἀπονέμειν.

There can be no question that in the Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians we have express citations from 1 and 2 Timothy. It is, to say the least, difficult to believe that a man like Polycarp, who had been a disciple of the Apostle John, and who, when he wrote this letter, was bishop of Smyrna and in full vigour of life, would have made such honourable use of letters which had been compiled by an unknown Paulinist a few years before. We regard the evidence of Polycarp as a fact of capital importance; for it removes any possible doubt that may hang over inferences drawn from Ignatius; and it supports us in our belief that the Pastoral Epistles were also known to Clement of Rome. For the sake of completeness, we may add echoes of the Letters in other extant second century Christian Literature. The three passages cited from the Epistle of Barnabas are not of necessity based on our Letters; and the same may be said of the four quotations from Justin Martyr, with the possible exception of that from *Dial.* § 47.

The So-called Second Epistle of Clement of Rome (*circ.* 120-140 A.D.).

§ 7 (2 Tim. ii. 4, 5). ἀγωνισώμεθα, εἰδότες ὅτι . . . οὐ πάντες στεφανοῦνται, εἰ μὴ οἱ πολλὰ κοπιάσαντες καὶ καλῶς ἀγωνισάμενοι . . . ὁ τὸν φθαρτὸν ἀγῶνα ἀγωνιζόμενος, ἐὰν εὑρεθῇ φθείρων . . . ἔξω βάλλεται τοῦ σταδίου.

§ 8 (1 Tim. vi. 14, 12). τηρήσατε τὴν σάρκα ἁγνὴν καὶ τὴν σφραγῖδα ἄσπιλον, ἵνα τὴν ζωὴν ἀπολάβωμεν.

§ 17 (Tit. ii. 12). μὴ ἀντιπαρελκώμεθα ἀπὸ τῶν κοσμικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν.

§ 20 (1 Tim. i. 17). τῷ μόνῳ Θεῷ ἀοράτῳ . . . ἡ δόξα κ.τ.λ.

The So-called Epistle of Barnabas (A.D. 70-132).

§ 7 (2 Tim. iv. 1). εἰ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὢν Κύριος καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἔπαθεν.

§ 12 (1 Tim. iii. 14). ἡ παράβασις διὰ τοῦ ὄφεως ἐν Εὔᾳ ἐγένετο.

§ 12 (1 Tim. iii. 16). υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς·

The Epistle to Diognetus (*circ.* A.D. 150).

* § 4 (1 Tim. iii. 16). τὸ δὲ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν θεοσεβείας μυστήριον μὴ προσδοκήσῃς δύνασθαι παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μαθεῖν.

* § 9 (Tit. iii. 4). ἦλθε δὲ ὁ καιρὸς ὃν Θεὸς προέθετο λοιπὸν φανερῶσαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χρηστότητα καὶ δύναμιν (ὢ τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ), οὐκ ἐμίσησεν ἡμᾶς . . . ἐλεῶν αὐτὸς τὰς ἡμετέρας ἁμαρτίας ἀνεδέξατο, αὐτὸς τὸν ἴδιον υἱὸν ἀπέδοτο λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

§ 11 (1 Tim. iii. 16). [μαθηταῖς] οἷς ἐφανέρωσεν ὁ Λόγος φανείς. This and the following section do not really belong to the Epistle.

Justin Martyr (*circ.* 140 A.D.).

Dial. § 7 (1 Tim. iv. 1). τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα καὶ δαιμόνια δοξολογοῦσιν.

§ 35 (1 Tim. iv. 1). ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτους εἶναι ἄνδρας, ὁμολογοῦντας ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι Χριστιανοὺς καὶ . . . Ἰησοῦν ὁμολογεῖν . . . Χριστόν, καὶ μὴ τὰ ἐκείνου διδάγματα διδάσκοντας ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς πλάνης πνευμάτων.

* § 47 (Tit. iii. 4). ἡ γὰρ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ἄμετρον τοῦ πλούτου αὐτοῦ τὸν μετανοοῦντα . . . ὡς δίκαιον . . . ἔχει.

§ 118 (2 Tim. iv. 1). ὅτι κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν ἁπάντων αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ Χριστός, εἶπον ἐν πολλοῖς.

The Acts of Paul and Thecla (not later than 170 A.D.).

* § 14 (2 Tim. ii. 18). λέγει οὗτος ἀνάστασιν γενέσθαι, ὅτι ἤδη γέγονεν ἐφ' οἷς ἔχομεν τέκνοις. Note also the use in this work of the names Demas and Hermogenes as ὑποκρίσεως γέμοντες, § 1, and Onesiphorus as seeking Paul, § 2.

Athenagoras (*circ.* 176).

Legatio, 16 (1 Tim. vi. 16). πάντα γὰρ ὁ Θεός ἐστιν αὐτὸς αὐτῷ, φῶς ἀπρόσιτον.

* 37 (1 Tim. ii. 2). τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγοιμεν.

Theodotus (*Excerpta ex Scriptis Theodoti*, Clem. Al. p. 350).

(1 Tim. vi. 16). καὶ ὁ μὲν φῶς ἀπρόσιτον εἴρηται.

The Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (*circ.*180).

* Euseb. *H.E.* v. i. (1 Tim. iii. 15). ἐνέσκηψεν ἡ ὀργὴ . . . εἰς Ἄτταλον Περγαμηνὸν τῷ γένει, στύλον καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἀεὶ γεγονότα.

* (1 Tim. vi. 13). ὁ δὲ . . . Ποθεινὸς . . . ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα ἐσύρετο . . . ὡς αὐτοῦ ὄντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀπεδίδου τὴν καλὴν μαρτυρίαν.

Euseb. *H.E.* v. 3 (1 Tim. iv. 3, 4). ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης, μὴ χρώμενος τοῖς κτίσμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . πεισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης πάντων ἀνέδην μετελάμβανε καὶ ηὐχαρίστει τῷ Θεῷ.

Theophilus of Antioch (*circ.* 181).

* *ad Autol.* i. 1 (2 Tim. iii. 8). φράσις εὐεπὴς τέρψιν παρέχει . . . ἀνθρώποις ἔχουσι τὸν νοῦν κατεφθαρμένον.

* *ad Autol.* ii. 16 (Tit. iii. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 4 (?)). ἔτι μὴν καὶ εὐλογήθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων γενόμενα, ὅπως ᾖ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς δεῖγμα τοῦ μέλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας πάντας τοὺς προσιόντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

ad Autol. iii. 14 (Tit. iii. 1; Tim. ii. 2). ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις, καὶ εὔχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν κελεύει ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεῖος λόγος, ὅπως ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν.

The Integrity of the Letters.

It is scarcely too much to say that but for the difficulty presented by their style, and the assumption that St. Paul never left Rome alive, no one would have suspected these letters of being a compilation. But inasmuch as no one has been found to deny the *bona fide* Pauline character of some sections of them—at least in 2 Timothy—those who impugn the genuineness of the letters as they have come down to us have been compelled to exercise much ingenuity in attempts to apportion the matter of the letters between St. Paul and the compiler or compilers. For an account of their schemes the student is referred to the articles on these epistles in Hastings *D. B.*, and the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and for a fuller account, to Moffatt's *Historical N. T.*

To those who agree that the problem presented by the style and the historical setting of the Pastorals is unsolved, but not insoluble, all attempts to decompose these letters will seem unprofitable. There is sound sense in the old scholastic maxim: "Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem". The case of the Pastorals is not like that of 2 Corinthians, in which plausible reasons may be alleged for theories of dislocation. There is no difficulty in presenting such an outline of 1 Tim. or 2 Tim. or Tit. as will show it to be a single letter, with as much unity of purpose as a *bona fide* letter—not a college essay—can be expected to have.

But even were we to grant, one moment, that the style and historical considerations must preclude a Pauline authorship for them, yet, the next moment, we find ourselves confronted by more serious objections to the theory of compilation. To begin with, the historical difficulty presented by the personal and local references in the admittedly Pauline sections is insurmountable, on the hypothesis that the whole of St. Paul's history is contained in the Acts.

Again, without using violent language about "forgery," it is not easy to explain why the alleged compiler should pretend to be St. Paul. The ascription of a book to an honoured name was not a precedent condition to its acceptance or acceptability in the primitive Church. Hebrews, and the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, and the Epistle to Diognetus do not claim anyone as their authors. Whoever it was that produced the Pastorals, he was just as good a practical Christian as St. Paul himself; and he had no compelling reason to hide his identity. The case of 2 Peter is different. That epistle, whoever wrote it, was always reckoned a disputed book.

Again, how are we to explain the honourable use, certainly by Polycarp, and probably by Clement of Rome and Ignatius, not to mention other later second century writers, of a work which only appeared, *ex hypothesi*, not earlier than 90 A.D.? And, further, if these epistles are due to a compiler, he must have been an extraordinarily clever man, and quite capable not only of supplementing the Pauline fragments, but of editing them. Now by the year 90 A.D. Timothy's name had become venerated in the Church. Is it likely that a Churchman of that time, writing too, as is alleged, with an ecclesiastical bias, would have permitted the publication of letters which certainly give the impression of Timothy as a not very heroic person? The treatment of Linus (2 Tim. iv. 21) raises a similar question. A tradition, which no one has ever questioned, names Linus as the first bishop of Rome; the subordinate position he occupies in this letter is, as Salmon has noted (*Introd. N.T.* p. 411), quite intelligible if St. Paul was the author of it. It is, on the other hand, extremely unlikely that an editor of the year 90 A.D., who had no scruple in writing in St. Paul's name, would not have given Linus a more prominent place.

These are a few of the difficulties which may be urged on the traditional side in this "contest of opposite improbabilities".

Analysis of 1 Timothy.

"Guard the Deposit."

A. i. 1, 2. Salutation.

B. i. 3-20: The Crisis, and the Men—Paul and Timothy.

(*a*) The Crisis: 3-11.

(1) 3-7. The motive of the letter is to provide Timothy with a memorandum of previous oral instructions for the combating of those who mischievously and ignorantly endeavour to oppose the Law to the Gospel.

(2) 8-11. This opposition is really factitious; inasmuch as the Law and the Gospel are, both of them, workings of law, God's law, the final cause of which is right conduct.

(*b*) The Men: 12-20.

(1) 12-17. Paul's own spiritual history illustrates the fundamentally identical moral basis of the Law and the Gospel. Paul had been "faithful," trustworthy, while under the Law; therefore Christ pardoned his violent opposition to the Gospel, because it was due to ignorance, though a sinful ignorance. Moreover, this whole transaction—the triumph of Christ's long-suffering over Paul's sinful antagonism—has an enduring value. It is an object lesson to encourage to repentance sinners to the end of time. Glory be to God!

(2) 18-20. The present charge to Timothy, although its immediate exciting cause is the recent action of Hymenæus and Alexander and their followers, ought not to be new in its substance to Timothy. It is practically identical with what the prophets gave utterance to at his ordination.

C. ii., iii. The foundations of Sound Doctrine.

False teaching is most effectually combated indirectly; not by controversy, with its negations, but by quiet, positive foundation work on which true views about God and Man can be based. We begin then with:—

(*a*) ii. 1—iii. 1 *a*. Public Prayer.

(1) ii. 1-7. Its universal scope; and the Divine sanction for catholicity in human sympathy.

(2) ii. 8—iii. 1 *a*. The Ministers of Public Prayer: men, not women; with a judgment as to the true function of Woman in the Church and in Society.

(*b*) iii. 1 *b*-16. The Ministry of the Divine Society.

(1) 1 *b*-7. The qualifications of the episcopus.

(2) 8-10, 12, 13. The qualifications of the deacons.

(3) 11. The qualifications of women Church-workers.

(4) 14-16. Caution to Timothy lest he should be tempted to think these details trivial, in comparison with more obviously spiritual things. The importance of rules depends on the importance of that with which they are concerned. The Church, for whose ministers rules have been just laid down, is the greatest Society in the world: human, yet divinely originated and inspired; the House of God; an extension of the Incarnation.

D. iv. A fresh word of prophecy (see i. 18) addressed to Timothy in his present office.

(*a*) 1-5. The false teaching more clearly defined as a spurious asceticism. This is condemned, *a priori*, by considerations (1) of the declared character and object of the material creation, and (2) of the purifying effect of benedictions.

(*b*) 6-16. The spurious asceticism, however, as it manifests itself in practice, is best combated (1), 6-10, by the Church teacher showing an example in his own person of genuine holiness, and (2), 11-16, by active pastoral care, courageous outspokenness and the diligent cultivation of all God-given ministerial graces.

E. v. 1—vi. 19. This naturally suggests the specification of directions for administration of the Church by a Father in God.

(*a*) v. 1, 2. He must not deal with his people *en masse*, but individually. He cannot treat alike old men and young men, elder women and younger women.

(*b*) v. 3-16. There is one class of the laity in particular which, because they have a special claim on the Church, need a discriminating care: the widows. The Church cannot afford to support all widows, nor would it be right to relieve their relatives, if they have any, of responsibility for them. Consequently, none can be entered on the list for relief but those over a certain age, and who have a good record for consistent Christian lives. Young widows had better marry again.

(*c*) v. 17-25. The questions of Church finance and discipline, as they concern widows, suggest recommendations on the same subjects, as they concern the presbyters: (1) 17, 18, finance; (2) 19-25, discipline, with, 23, a parenthetical personal counsel to Timothy, suggested by the word *pure* in 22.

(*d*) vi. 1, 2. Ruling principles for the conduct of Christians who are slaves, towards heathen and Christian masters respectively.

(*e*) vi. 3-19. A right judgment in all these matters which affect our daily life depends on right basal convictions as to the true values of things material and spiritual.

(1) 3-10. The false teachers reverse the true order: they regard religion as a sub-section of the world; whereas the world has its own place—an honourable place—as subordinate to religion.

(2) 11-16. A solemn adjuration to Timothy to adhere to the principles just laid down; and

(3) 17-19. to urge the observance of them upon the well-to-do members of the Christian Society.

F. vi. 20-21. Final appeal, summing up the perennial antagonism between character (the natural fruit of the faith) and mere intellectualism.

Analysis of 2 Timothy.

Sursum Corda.

A. i. 1, 2. Salutation.

B. i. 3—ii. 13. Considerations which should strengthen Timothy's moral courage (*a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*), interspersed with appeals to his loyalty (*α*, *β*, *γ*, *δ*, *ε*).

(*a*) 3-5. Paul's thoughts of, and prayers for, him; and Paul's recognition of Timothy's faith.

(*b*) 6, 7. An objective fact in Timothy's own spiritual history: his ordination; since when there is available for his use, Power, Love, and Discipline, the gifts of God.

(*a*) 8-10. An appeal based on thoughts of the Gospel, as the power of God.

(*c*) 11, 12. Paul's own steadfastness.

(*β*, *γ*) 13, 14. Appeals based on loyalty to the human teacher, and to the Divine Spirit.

(*d*) 15. The deterrent example of the disloyal of Asia.

(*e*) 16-18. The stimulating example of Onesiphorus.

(*δ*) ii. 1, 2. An appeal for the provision of a succession of loyal teachers.

(*ε*) ii. 3-13. An appeal based on "the Word of the Cross"; *i.e.*, Suffering is the precedent condition of glory. This is exemplified in the earthly analogies of the soldier, the athlete, and the field-labourer; in the actual experiences of Jesus Christ Himself, and of Paul.

C. ii. 14-26. General exhortations to Timothy as a Church teacher, as regards (*a*) 14-18, the positive and negative subject-matter of his instructions; (*b*) 19-21, the true and optimistic conception of the Church in relation to all teachers, true and false; (*c*) 22-26, the personal equipment of the true teacher, and his treatment of the erring.

D. iii. 1—iv. 8. A word of prophecy setting forth—

(*a*) iii. 1-9. The practical shortcomings of the false teachers.

(*b*) iii. 10-17. A recalling of Timothy's past spiritual history: (1) 10-13, the conditions under which his discipleship began; (2) 14-17, the holy persons by whom, and the sacred writings on which, his youth had been nourished.

(*c*) iv. 1-8. A concluding solemn adjuration to play the man while there is time. As for Paul, the contest is over, the crown is in sight; there is a crown for Timothy, too, if he takes Paul's place.

E. iv. 9-22. Personal details: Instructions, 9, 11, 13, 21; News about other members of the Pauline comradeship. 10, 11, 12, 20; A warning, 14, 15; A reminiscence and a confident hope, 16-18; Salutations and greetings, 19, 21; Final benediction, 22.

Analysis of Titus.

"*Maintain Good Works.*"

A. i. 1-4. Salutation.

B. i. 5-16. The position of affairs in Crete, which (*a*), 5-9, necessitates that the foundation of Church organisation—the presbyterate—be well and truly laid; in view of (*b*), 10-16, the natural unruliness and bad character of the people, aggravated by Jewish immoral sophistries.

C. ii. 1—iii. 11. Heads of necessary elementary moral instruction for the Cretan folk.

(*a*) ii. 1-10. For aged men and aged women; for young women and young men—and what is said about these latter applies also to Titus—and slaves.

(*b*) ii. 11-15. The eternal sanction for this insistence on the practice of elementary virtues is the all-embracing scope of the Gospel of God's Grace; which has been visibly manifested, with its call to repentance, its assurance of help, and its certain hope.

(*c*) iii. 1, 2. Obedience to the civil authority is also a Gospel virtue.

(*d*) iii. 3-7. These instructions are not given in a spirit of superiority. We ourselves were once in as bad moral condition as are the Cretans, if not worse, until we came to know, and test the love of God, unmerited and saving.

(*e*) iii. 8-11. In conclusion, the sum of all is: Let the people maintain good works, and shun useless speculations. Let Titus not be lax in dealing with leaders of the false teaching.

D. iii. 12, 13. Personal instructions.

E. iii. 14. Concluding summary, repeating the teaching of 8-11.

F. iii. 15. Final salutation.

The Text.

The text which is printed above the exposition is in the main that of Westcott and Hort. In a very few cases other readings have been adopted in this text (see *e.g.* 1 Tim. ii. 8; Tit. ii. 4, iii. 9); and in some places their punctuation has been modified.

The *apparatus criticus* is based on that of Tischendorf's eighth edition. The readings of the Old Latin fragments, r, Cod. Frisingensis, have been added, and the references to m (*Speculum*) have been given according to the edition by Weihrich in the Vienna *Corpus Script. Eccles. Lat.* Of the uncial MSS. cited by Tisch., E_3 (Cod. Petropolitanus, or Sangermanensis, ix. or x.) has not been noted, since it is merely a transcript of D_2. On the other hand, it has been thought best to cite both F_2 and G_3, since it is not certain that the latter is a copy of the former, though both are derived from one exemplar.

Only the most important cursives are mentioned in these notes. The reader will understand that the attestation of KLP carries with it, in most cases, that of the great bulk of the cursive MSS. Neither has it been thought advisable to cite the more obscure versions. Even if their readings were critically ascertained they would not carry much weight. For a similar reason patristic citations are sparingly used. Subjoined is a list of the authorities cited in the critical notes.

ℵ, Cod. Sinaiticus, iv. St Petersburg.

A, Cod. Alexandrinus, v. London.

C, Cod. Ephraemi rescriptus, v. Paris. It does not contain 1 Tim. i. 1-iii. 9, μυστη | ριον.

D (D_2), Cod. Claromontanus, vi. Paris.

F (F_2), Cod. Augiensis, ix. Trinity College, Cambridge.
G (G_3), Cod. Boernerianus, ix. Dresden.
H (H_3), Cod. Coislinianus, vi. Fragments. Those that contain portions of the Pastorals are in Paris and Turin. It only contains: 1 Tim. iii. 7-13, vi. 9-13; 2 Tim. ii. 1-9; Tit. i. 1-3, 15—ii. 5, iii, 13-15.
I (I^2), Cod. Tischendorfianus (Petropolitanus, Tisch.), v. St. Petersburg. Contains only Tit. i. 1-13.
K (K_2) Cod. Mosquensis, ix. Moscow.
L (L_2), Cod. Bibliothecae Angelicae, ix. Rome.
P (P_2), Cod. Porphyrianus, ix. St. Petersburg.

Of the Old Latin MSS. cited, d, e, f, g are the Latin portions of the bilingual uncials, D_2, E_3, F_2 and G_3 respectively. m is the treatise entitled *Speculum*, practically a catena of texts or *testimonia*, formerly ascribed to St Augustine. r is the Cod. Frisingensis, v. or vi. (Munich) fragments, containing *inter alia*, 1 Tim. i. 12—ii. 15; v. 18—vi. 13.

The only MSS. of the Vulgate cited are Cod. Amiatinus (am.), A.D. 716, Florence, and Cod. Fuldensis (fuld.) A.D. 541-546, Fulda in Germany.

The other versions are indicated as follows:—
syr^{pesh} (Tisch., syr^{sch}) = Peshitto Syriac.
syr^{hcl} (Tisch., syr^{p}) = Harkleian Syriac.
syrr = both Syriac Versions.
boh (Tisch., cop.) = Bohairic Egyptian.
sah = Sahidic Egyptian.
arm = Armenian.
go = Gothic.

For a complete bibliography of the Pastoral Epistles the reader is referred to the articles, "Timothy, Epistle to," and "Titus, Epistle to," by W. Lock, in Hastings' *D.B.*, vol. iv., pp. 775, 785, and the articles "Timothy and Titus (Epistles)," by J. Moffatt, in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. To the articles themselves—the former temperately conservative, the latter, uncompromisingly anti-traditional—the present writer is much indebted. Diligent use has also been made of the labours of the following commentators on the continuous text: St. Chrysostom's Homilies, full of good sense and practical wisdom; Bengel, pithy, direct and spiritual; Ellicott, a sound grammarian from the classical Greek standpoint, and therefore useful as a warning against possible pitfalls, but very dry; Alford, still most serviceable as the variorum edition of A.D. 1865; J. H. Bernard (*Cambridge Greek Testament*) whose notes on the ethical language of the Epistles

are most illuminating, and H. von Soden, in the *Hand-Commentar*, remarkable for subtle verbal analysis; but his exegesis is vitiated by his critical position as to the authorship and date of the letters. Suspicion and half-heartedness do not make for profound exposition.

Plummer's large treatment of certain sections, in the *Expositor's Bible*, has been found helpful and suggestive. Field's *Notes* (alas, too few!) *on Trans. N.T.* are indispensable; and H. P. Liddon's analysis of 1 Timothy is masterly.

On the general subject of the Epistles, Salmon's *Introduction N.T.* (p. 397 *sqq.*), Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays* (xi., xii.), Wace's Introduction in the *Speaker's Commentary*, J. H. Bernard's Introduction (*Cambridge Greek Testament*), Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, and Hort's *Judaistic Chistianity* and *Christian Ecclesia* have been largely made use of. It has not, however, been thought necessary, especially when space had to be considered, to specify in every case the authority for the sentiment expressed, or the explanation adopted. In any case, the Church, in the long run, acts on the counsel of Thomas à Kempis: "Non quaeras quis hoc dixerit: sed quid dicatur attende" (*De Imit. Christi*, i. 5).

September, 1909.

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ Ā

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ [a] ἀπόστολος [a] Χριστοῦ [a] Ἰησοῦ [1] [b] κατ' [b] ἐπιταγὴν [2] [c] Θεοῦ [c] σωτῆρος [c] ἡμῶν καὶ [3] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [4] τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν,

a 2 Cor. i. 1, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 1, 2 Tim. i. 1, *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 1, Tit. i. 1. b Rom. xvi. 26, Tit. i. 3. c Jude 25, *cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 3, iv. 10, Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4.

[1] So ℵDFGP, 80, one other, d, f, g, fuld., boh., syr^{hcl}; Ἰησ. Χριστ. AKL, am., syr^{pesh}, arm.

[2] ἐπαγγελίαν ℵ.

[3] Ins. Κυρίου ℵ^{c}KL; om. AD*FGP, 17, 31, seven others, d, f, g, vg., go., syrr., sah., boh., arm.

[4] So AD*FGP, 17, five others, d, f, g, am., fuld., go., sah., syrr.; Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵ^{c}KL, boh., arm.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1-2. Salutation.—Ver. 1. **ἀπόστολος Χρ. Ἰησ.** The use of this official title is an indication that the Pastoral Epistles were not merely private letters (*ctr.* **Παῦλος δέσμιος Χρ. Ἰησ.**, Philem. 1), but were intended to be read to the Churches committed to the charge of Timothy and Titus respectively. The phrase means simply one *sent by* Christ, not primarily one *belonging to* Christ. *Cf.* Phil. ii. 25, where Epaphroditus is spoken of as **ὑμῶν ἀπόστ.**, and 2 Cor. viii. 23, **ἀπόστ. ἐκκλησιῶν. ἀπόστ. Χρ. Ἰησ.** is also found in 2 Cor. i. 1, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 1, 2 Tim. i. 1; **ἀπόστ. Ἰησ. Χρ.** in 1 Cor. i. 1, Tit. i. 1. The difference in the use *Jesus Christ* and *Christ Jesus* seems to be this: in each case the first member of the compound name indicates whether the historical or the notional idea of the Person is chiefly in the writer's mind. *Jesus Christ* briefly expresses the proposition, "Jesus is the Christ"; it embodies the first theological assertion concerning Jesus; it represents the conception of the historical Jesus in the minds of those who had seen Him. St. John, St. Peter and St. James employ this name when speaking of our Lord. But in *Christ Jesus*, on the other hand, the theological conception of *the Christ* predominates over that of the actual *Jesus* Who had been seen, felt and heard by human senses. Accordingly we find *Christ Jesus* in every stage of the Pauline Epistles; and, as we should expect, more frequently in the later than in the earlier letters. In almost every instance of the occurrence of *Jesus Christ* in the Pastoral Epistles the thought of the passage concerns the humanity, or historical aspect, of our Lord. Thus in Tit. i. 1, "a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ," we could not substitute *Christ Jesus* without weakening the antithesis. See note there. St. Paul, here as elsewhere, claims to have been as truly *sent* by Christ as were those who were apostles before him.

κατ' ἐπιταγήν: *in obedience to the command.* The full phrase **κατ' ἐπιτ. θ. σ. ἡμῶν** occurs again (**τοῦ σωτ. ἡμ. θεοῦ**) in a similar context in Tit. i. 3; **κατ' ἐπιτ. τοῦ αἰωνίου θ.** in Rom. xvi. 26. In 1 Cor. vii. 6, 2 Cor. viii. 8, **κατ' ἐπιτ.** is used in a different sense.

St. Paul more commonly refers the originating cause of his mission to the *will of God* (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1). He would hardly say *through the will of Christ*, **θέλημα** being used of the eternal counsel of the Godhead; but inasmuch as the *command* is the consequent of the *will*, he can speak of his apostleship as being due to the *command*

d Phil. iv. 3, 2. Τιμοθέῳ [d] γνησίῳ [e] τέκνῳ [f] ἐν [f] πίστει· χάρις, [g] ἔλεος, εἰρήνη ἀπὸ
Tit. i. 4,
cf. 2 Cor. viii. 8, Θεοῦ Πατρὸς [1] καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. 3. Καθὼς
Phil. ii. 20, Ecclus. vii. 18.

e 1 Cor. iv. 17, ver. 18, 2 Tim. i. 2, ii. 1, Tit. i. 4. Philem. 10, 3 John 4.

f Ver. 4, 1 Tim. ii. 7, Tit. iii. 15.

g 2 Tim. i. 2, 2 John 3, Jude 2.

[1] Ins. ἡμῶν ℵcDcKLP, syrr., sah.

of Christ Jesus, as well as of God the Father. In this matter Jesus Christ is co-ordinated with God the Father in Gal. i. 1; while in Rom. i. 4, 5. Paul's apostleship is "through Jesus Christ our Lord" only. On the other hand, in Tit. i. 3, St. Paul says he was intrusted with the message "according to the commandment of God our Saviour". Here it is to be noted that the *command* proceeds equally from God and Christ Jesus. This language could hardly have been used if St. Paul conceived of Christ Jesus as a creature. Moulton and Milligan (*Expositor*, vii., vii. 379) compare St. Paul's use of **ἐπιταγή** as a *Divine* command with its technical use in heathen dedicatory inscriptions. We cannot, with Chrys., narrow the "commandment of God" to the specific date of St. Paul's commission by the Church, whether in Acts xiii. 2 or on an earlier occasion. St. Paul claimed that he had been "separated from his mother's womb" (Gal. i. 15).

θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν: Westcott on 1 John iv. 14 has an instructive note on the Biblical use of the term **σωτήρ**. "The title is confined (with the exception of the writings of St. Luke) to the later writings of the N.T., and is not found in the central group of St. Paul's Epistles." It may be added that in the Lucan references (Luke i. 47, of God; ii. 11, Acts v. 31, xiii. 23, of Christ) the term **σωτήρ** has not primarily its full later evangelical import, and would be best rendered *deliverer*, as in the constant O.T. application of the term to God Perhaps the same is true of Phil. iii. 20, and Eph. v. 23, where it is used of Christ. On the other hand, apart from **ὁ σωτὴρ τ. κόσμου** (John iv. 42; 1 John iv. 14), the conventional evangelical use is found: of God the Father in (*a*) 1 Tim. i. 1, Jude 25, **θεὸς σωτὴρ ἡμῶν**; (*b*) 1 Tim. ii. 3, Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4, **ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν θεός**; (*c*) 1 Tim. iv. 10, **σωτήρ** in apposition to **θεός** in the preceding clause; of Christ, in (*a*) 2 Tim. i. 10, **ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς**; (*b*) Tit. i. 4, iii. 6, **Χρ. Ἰησ. ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν**; (*c*) 2 Pet. i. 11, ii. 20, iii. 18, **ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ Ἰησ. Χρ.**; (*d*) 2 Pet. iii. 2, **ὁ Κύριος καὶ σωτήρ**. To the (*c*) class belong, perhaps, Tit. ii. 13, 2 Pet. i. 1, **ὁ [μέγας] θεὸς [ἡμῶν] καὶ σωτὴρ [ἡμῶν] Ἰησ. Χρ.**; but see note on Tit. ii. 13.

In the text, there is an antithesis between the offices of God as *our Saviour* and of Christ Jesus as *our hope*. The one points to the past, at least chiefly, and the other to the future. In speaking of the saving action of God, St, Paul uses the aorist 2 Tim. i. 9, Tit. ii. 11, iii. 4, 5. He *saved* us, potentially. See further on ch. ii. 3. God, as the Council of Trent says (Sess. vi. cap. 7), is *the efficient cause* of our justification, while Jesus, "our righteousness," besides being *the meritorious cause*, may be said to be *the formal cause;* for "the righteousness of God by which He maketh us righteous" is embodied in Jesus, Who "was made unto us . . . righteousness and sanctification" (1 Cor. i. 30). We advance from salvation to sanctification; and accordingly we must not narrow down the conception *Christ Jesus our hope* to mean "the hope of Israel" (Acts xxiii. 6, xxviii. 20); but rather the historical manifestation of the Son of God as Christ Jesus is the ground of our "hope of glory" (Col. i. 27). Our hope is that "the body of our humiliation will be conformed to the body of His glory" (Phil. iii. 20, 21). See also Eph. iv. 13. Our hope is that "we shall be like Him" (1 John iii. 2, 3). See also Tit. ii. 13, **προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα**. For this vivid use of an abstract noun compare Eph. ii. 14, **αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν.**

Ignatius borrows this noble appellation: *Magn.* 11; *Trall.* inscr., "Jesus Christ Who is our hope through our resurrection unto Him"; *Trall.* 2, "Jesus Christ our hope; for if we live in Him, we shall also be found in Him". See also Polycarp, 8.

Ver. 2. **γνησίῳ** qualifies the compound **τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει,** just as in Tit. i. 4 it qualifies **τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν.** As in the relation of the heavenly Father to those who are His children by adoption and grace, some are "led by the Spirit of God," and so are genuine sons of

[h] παρεκάλεσά σε [i] προσμεῖναι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, πορευόμενος εἰς Μακε- h 1 Cor. xvi. 12, 2 Cor.
δονίαν, ἵνα [k] παραγγείλῃς τισὶν μὴ [l] ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, 4. μηδὲ viii. 6, ix. 5, xii. 18.
i Matt. xv.

32 = Mark viii. 2, Acts xviii. 18.
k 1 Cor. vii. 10, xi. 17, 1 Thess. iv. 11, 2 Thess. iii. 4, 6, 10, 12, 1 Tim. iv. 11, v. 7, vi. 13, 17.
l 1 Tim. vi. 3 only, not LXX.

God, so in the filial relationships of earth—physical, spiritual, or intellectual—some sons realise their vocation, others fail to do so. **γνήσιος** (and **γνησίως**, Phil. ii. 20) is only found in the N.T. in Paul. See reff. It might be rendered *lawful, legitimate*, as **γυνὴ γνησία** means "lawful wife" (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 382). Dean Bernard (*comm. in loc.*) cites an interesting parallel from Philo (*de Vit. Cont.* p. 482, ed. Mangey), where "the young men among the Therapeutae are described as ministering to their elders **καθάπερ υἱοὶ γνήσιοι.**" **τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει**: The parallel from Tit. i. 4 quoted above proves that **πίστις** here is *the* faith, as A.V. Absence of the article before familiar Christian terms is a characteristic of the Pastorals. *Cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 15, "In Christ Jesus I begat you through the gospel". See also Gal. iv. 19, Philem. 10; and, for the term **τέκνον** as applied to Timothy, see reff. St. Paul "begat him through the gospel" on the first missionary journey. He was already a disciple in Acts xvi. 1. Nothing can be safely inferred from the variation **ἀγαπητῷ** in 2 Tim. i. 2 for **γνησίῳ**. The selection from among these semi-conventional terms of address is influenced by passing moods of which the writer is not wholly conscious; but a pseudepigraphic author would be careful to observe uniformity.

ἔλεος as an element in the salutation in addition to **χάρις** and **εἰρήνη** is only found, in the Pauline Epistles, in 1 and 2 Timothy. See reff. "Mercy" is used in an informal benediction, Gal. vi. 16, "Peace be upon them, and mercy". Bengel notes that personal experience of the mercy of God makes a man a more efficient minister of the Gospel. See vv. 13, 16, 1 Cor. vii. 25, 2 Cor. iv. 1, Heb. ii. 17.

ee also Tobit vii. 12 (א) **ὁ κύριος . . . ποιήσαι ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἔλεος κ. εἰρήνην** and Wisd. iii. 9, iv. 15, **χάρις κ. ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ**. If one may hazard a conjecture as to what prompted St. Paul to wish *mercy* to Timothy rather than to Titus, it may be a subtle indication of the apostle's anxiety as to Timothy's administrative capacity. Another variation in the salutation in Titus is the substitution of *Saviour* for *Lord*. This calls for no comment.

Note the anarthrous **θεὸς πατήρ** as in all the Pauline salutations, with the exception of 1 Thess., where we have simply **χάρις ὑμῖν κ. εἰρήνη.** In Colossians the blessing is only from God the Father. **ἡμῶν** is added to **πατρὸς** except in 2 Thess. and the Pastorals.

Vv. 3-7. THE MOTIVE OF THIS LETTER: to provide Timothy with a written memorandum of previous verbal instructions, especially with a view to novel speculations about the Law which sap the vitality of the Gospel; the root of which is sincerity, and its fruit, love.

Ver. 3. **καθώς**: The apodosis supplied at the end of ver. 4 in the R.V., *so do I now*, is feebler than the *so do* of the A.V. We need something more vigorous. St. Paul was more anxious that Timothy should *charge some*, etc., than that he should merely *abide at Ephesus*. This is implied in the A.V., in which *so do* = *stay there and be a strong ruler*.

An exact parallel occurs in Mark i. 2. Similar anacolutha are found in Rom. v. 12, Gal. ii. 4, 5, 6, Eph. iii. 1.

παρεκάλεσά σε: It is far-fetched to regard this word as specially expressive of a *mild* command, as Chrys. suggests. **παρακαλεῖν** constantly occurs, and with very varying meanings, in the Pauline Epistles. **διεταξάμην** is used in the corresponding place in Tit. i. 5, because there the charge concerns a series of injunctions.

προσμεῖναι: *ut remaneres* (Vulg.). The word (see Acts xviii. 18) naturally implies that St. Paul and Timothy had been together at Ephesus, and that St. Paul left Timothy there as vicar apostolic.

πορευόμενος refers to St. Paul, not to Timothy, as De Wette alleged. The grammatical proof of this is fully gone into by Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 404, "If the subject of the infinitive is the same as that of the finite verb, any attributes which it may have are put in the nominative".

It is unnecessary here to prove that it is impossible to fit this journey of St. Paul to Macedonia, and Timothy's stay at Ephesus connected therewith, into the period covered by the Acts.

τισίν: **τινες** is intentionally vague. The writer has definite persons in his mind, but for some reason he does not

m Acts viii· [m] προσέχειν [n] μύθοις καὶ [o] γενεαλογίαις [p] ἀπεράντοις, αἵτινες [q] ἐκ-
6, 10, 11, xvi. 14, 1 Tim. iii. 8, iv. 1, 13. ζητήσεις [1] [r] παρέχουσι μᾶλλον ἢ [s] οἰκονομίαν [2] Θεοῦ τὴν [t] ἐν [t] πίστει.

Tit. i. 14, Heb. ii. 1, vii. 13, 2 Peter i. 19. n 1 Tim. iv. 7, 2 Tim. iv. 4, Tit. i. 14, 2 Pet. i. 16, Wisd. xvii. 4, Ecclus. xx. 19. o Tit. iii. 9 only, not LXX. p Here only, N.T., Job xxxvi. 26, 3 Macc. ii. 9. q Here only, not LXX, see 1 Tim. vi. 4. r 1 Tim. vi. 17, Tit. ii. 7, etc. s 1 Cor. ix. 17, Eph. i. 10, iii. 2, 9, Col. i. 25. t See ver. 1.

[1] So ℵA, 17, three others; ζητήσεις DFGKLP.

[2] So ℵAFGKLP, boh., syrhcl-txt, arm.; οἰκοδομίαν Dc, 192, Dam. txt; οἰκοδομήν D*, Iren., go., syrpesh and hcl-mg; *aedificationem* d, f, g, m50, vg. See Eph. iv. 29.

choose to specify them. To do so, in this case, would have had a tendency to harden them in their heresy, "render them more shameless" (Chrys.). The introduction of the personal element into controversy has a curiously irritating effect. For this use of **τινες** see 1 Cor. iv. 18, 2 Cor. iii. 1, x. 2, Gal. i. 7, ii. 12, 1 Tim. i. 6, 19, v. 15, vi. 10, 21, 2 Tim. ii. 18.

μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν: This compound occurs again in 1 Tim. vi. 3, and means *to teach a gospel or doctrine different from that which I have taught.* **ἕτερος** certainly seems to connote difference *in kind.* Gal. i. 6, **ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο,** and 2 Cor. xi. 4, illustrate St. Paul's language here. The heresy may have been of recent origin, and not yet completely systematised—heresy of course does not aim at finality—but St. Paul does not mean to deal gently with it. It was to him false and accursed (*cf.* Gal. i. 8, 9). His forebodings for the church in Ephesus (Acts xx. 29, 30) were being fulfilled now. Hort (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 134) compares the **διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις** of Heb. xiii. 9.

St. Paul elsewhere uses compounds with **ἕτερο**, *e.g.*, 2 Cor. vi. 14, **ἑτεροζυγεῖν**; and more remarkably still, when quoting Isa. xxviii. 11 in 1 Cor. xiv. 21, he substitutes **ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις** for **διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας** of the LXX. The word is found in Ignat. *ad Polyc.* 3, **οἱ δοκοῦντες ἀξιόπιστοι εἶναι καὶ ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες.**

Ver. 4. **μηδὲ προσέχειν**: *nor to pay attention to.* This perhaps refers primarily to the hearers of the **ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι** rather than to the false teachers themselves. See reff.

μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις: "Polybius uses both terms in similarly close connection, *Hist.* ix. 2, 1" (Ell.). Two aspects of, or elements in, the one aberration from sound doctrine.

Some light is thrown upon this clause by other passages in this group of letters (1 Tim. i. 6, 7, iv. 7, vi. 4, 20; 2 Tim. ii. 14, 16, 23, iv. 4; Tit. i. 10, 14, iii. 9). The myths are expressly called Jewish (Tit. i. 14), and this affords a good argument that **νομοδιδάσκαλοι** and **νόμος**, in 1 Tim. i. 7, 8 and Tit. iii. 9, refer to the Mosaic Law, not restricting the term *Law* to the Pentateuch. Now a considerable and important part of the Mosaic legislation has relation only to Palestine and Jerusalem; it had no practical significance for the devotional life of the Jews of the Dispersion, with the exception of the community that worshipped at Hierapolis in Egypt. There is a strong temptation to mystics to justify to themselves the continued use of an antiquated sacred book by a mystical interpretation of whatever in it has ceased to apply to daily life. Thus Philo (*De Vit. Contempl.* § 3) says of the Therapeutae, "They read the holy Scriptures, and explain the philosophy of their fathers in an allegorical manner, regarding the written words as symbols of hidden truth which is communicated in obscure figures". Those with whom St. Paul deals in the Pastoral Epistles were not the old-fashioned conservative Judaisers whom we meet in the Acts and in the earlier Epistles; but rather the promoters of an eclectic synthesis of the then fashionable Gentile philosophy and of the forms of the Mosaic Law. **μῦθοι,** then, here and elsewhere in the Pastorals (see reff.), would refer, not to the stories and narrative of the O.T. taken in their plain straightforward meaning, but to the arbitrary allegorical treatment of them.

γενεαλογίαι may similarly refer to the genealogical matter in the O.T. which is usually skipped by the modern reader; but which by a mystical explanation of the derivations of the nomenclature could be made to justify their inclusion in a sacred book, every syllable of which might be supposed antecedently to contain edification. This general interpretation, which is that of Weiss, is

5. Τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς [u]παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ [v]καθαρᾶς [v]καρδίας καὶ [w]συνειδήσεως [w]ἀγαθῆς καὶ [x]πίστεως [x y]ἀνυποκρίτου· 6. ὧν τινὲς [a]ἀστοχήσαντες [a]ἐξετράπησαν εἰς [b]ματαιολογίαν, 7. θέλοντες

u Acts v. 28, xvi. 24, 1 Thess. iv. 2, ver. 18, not LXX.
v Ps. l. (li.) 12, Matt.
w Acts xxiii. 1, 1 Tim. i. 19, 1 Pet. iii. 16, 21.
x 2 Tim. i. 5.
y Rom. xii. 9, 2 Cor. vi. 6, Jas. iii. 17, 1 Pet. i. 22.
z 1 Tim. vi. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 18 only, N.T., Ecclus. vii. 19, viii. 9.
a 1 Tim. v. 15, vi. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 4, Heb. xii. 13.
b Here only, not LXX. *cf* Tit. i. 10.

supported by Ignat. *Magn.* 8, "Be not seduced by strange doctrines nor by antiquated fables (**ἑτεροδοξίαις μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς**), which are profitless. For if even unto this day we live after the manner of Judaism (**κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν**), we avow that we have not received grace." Hort maintains that **γενεαλογίαι** here has a derived meaning, "all the early tales adherent, as it were, to the births of founders" (see *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 135 *sqq.*). On the other hand, Irenæus (*Haer.* Praef. 1 and Tertullian (*adv. Valentin.* 3; *de Praescript.* 33) suppose that the Gnostic groupings of *aeons* in genealogical relationships are here alluded to. It was natural that they should read the N.T. in the light of controversies in which they themselves were engaged.

ἀπεράντοις: *endless, interminatis* (Vulg.), *infinitis* (m.), because leading to no certain conclusion. Discussions which do not concern realities are interminable, not from their profundity, as the ocean is popularly speaking unfathomable in parts, but because they lead to no convincing end. One end or conclusion is as good as another. The choice between them is a matter of taste.

αἵτινες: qualitative, *they are of such a kind as, the which* (R.V.).

ἐκζητήσεις: *Questionings* to which no answer can be given, which are not worth answering. See reff. on vi. 4. Their unpractical nature is implied by their being contrasted with **οἰκονομία θεοῦ**. Life is a trust, a stewardship, committed to us by God. Anything that claims to belong to religion, and at the same time is prejudicial to the effectual discharge of this trust is self-condemned.

παρέχουσι: **παρέχω** is used here as in the phrase **κόπους παρέχω**.

It will be observed that **οἰκονομία** is here taken subjectively and actively (*the performance of the duty of an* **οἰκονόμος** entrusted to a man by God; so also in Col. i. 25); not objectively and passively (*the dispensation of God, i.e.*, the Divine plan of salvation). The Western reading **οἰκοδομήν** or **οἰκοδομίαν**, *aedificationem*, is easier; but the text gives a deeper meaning.

τὴν ἐν πίστει: This is best taken as in *the* faith; *cf.* ver. 2, ii. 7, Tit. iii. 15. The trust committed to us by God is exercised in the sphere of the faith.

The aposiopesis at the end of ver. 4 is due to an imperative need felt by St. Paul to explain at once, and develop the thought of, **οἰκονομία θεοῦ**. The true teaching—that of the apostle and of Timothy—would be the consequence of the charge given by Timothy and would issue in, be productive of, an **οἰκονομία θεοῦ**. This **οἰκονομ. θ.** is *the object aimed at*, **τέλος**, *of the charge;* and is further defined as *love*, etc.

This is the only place in Paul in which **τέλος** means *the final cause*. In every other instance it means *termination, result, i.e. consequence*. 1 Peter i. 9 is perhaps an instance of a similar use.

The charge is referred to again in ver. 18. See also 1 Thess. iv. 2. The expressed object of the charge being the comprehensive virtue, love, it is strange that Ellicott should characterise this exegesis as "too narrow and exclusive". Bengel acutely observes that St. Paul does not furnish Timothy with profound arguments with which to refute the heretics, because the special duty of a church ruler is concerned with what is positively necessary. The love here spoken of is that which is "the fulfilment of the law" (Rom. xiii. 10); and its nature is further defined by its threefold source. Heart, conscience, faith, mark stages in the evolution of the inner life of a man. Heart, or disposition, is earlier in development than conscience; and faith, in the case of those who have it, is later than conscience.

καθαρὰ καρδία is an O.T. phrase. See reff. **συνείδησις** is **καθαρά** in 1 Tim. iii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 3; it is **ἀγαθή** in reff.; **καλή** in Heb. xiii. 18; it occurs without any epithet in 1 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. i. 15. **πίστις ἀνυπόκριτος** occurs again 2 Tim. i. 5; and the adj. is applied to **ἀγάπη**, Rom. xii. 9, 2 Cor. vi. 6. See other reff. It is evident that no stress can be laid on the choice of epithets in any particular passage.

Ver. 6. **ὧν**: *i.e.*, the disposition, con-

c Luke v. 17, Acts v. 34, not LXX. εἶναι [c]νομοδιδάσκαλοι, μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἃ λέγουσιν, μήτε περὶ τίνων [d]διαβεβαιοῦνται. 8. Οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι καλὸς ὁ νόμος ἐάν τις
d Tit. iii. 8, not LXX. αὐτῷ [e]νομίμως χρῆται[1]· 9. εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὅτι δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ
e 2 Tim. ii. 5, 4 Macc. vi. 18 only.

[1] So ℵDFGKL; χρήσηται AP, 73.

science, and faith as qualified. **τινὲς**: see note on ver. 3. **ἀστοχήσαντες**: (*aberrantes*, Vulg.; *recedentes*, m[7]; *excedentes*, m[50]). In the other passages where this word occurs the A.V. and R.V. have *erred;* here *swerved.* They *missed the mark* in point of fact. It may be questioned whether they really had aimed at a pure heart, etc. But having missed, being in fact "corrupted in mind" vi. 5; "branded in their conscience," iv. 2; and "reprobate concerning the faith," 2 Tim. iii. 8, they did not secure as their own *love*, practical beneficence, but its exact opposite, empty talking, *vaniloquium*, Tit. i. 10. The content of this empty talking is analysed in Tit. iii. 9.

It is more natural to suppose that **ὧν** is governed by **ἀστοχήσαντες** (Huther, Grimm, Alf.) than by **ἐξετράπησαν** (Ellicott). **ἀστοχεῖν** is used absolutely with **περί** elsewhere in the Pastorals; but in Ecclus. it governs a genitive directly. **ἐκτρέπεσθαι** governs both gen. and acc.; the latter in vi. 20.

Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 373, quote examples of **ἀστοχέω** from papyri (ii. B.C. ii. A.D.) in the sense "fail" or "forget," *e.g.*, **ἀστοχήσαντες τοῦ καλῶς ἔχοντος. ἐξετράπησαν** introduces a new metaphor: *they had turned aside out of the right path.*—**ματαιολογία**: Here only; but **ματαιολόγοι** occurs, Tit. i. 10. See vi. 20: "Vanitas maxima, ubi de rebus divinis non vere disseritur, Rom. i. 21" (Bengel).

Ver. 7. **νομοδιδάσκαλοι**: The Mosaic or Jewish law is meant. See Tit. iii. 9. The term is used seriously, of official teachers of the law, in reff.

μὴ νοοῦντες, κ.τ.λ.: *Though they understand neither, etc.* The participle is concessive, and **με** is here subjective, as usual, expressing St. Paul's opinion about them. For the sentiment *cf.* vi. 4, 1 Cor. viii. 2. **λέγουσιν** refers to the substance of their assertions, while **διαβεβαιοῦνται** (*affirmant*, see Tit. iii. 8) is expressive of the confident manner (R.V.) in which they made them. They did not grasp the force either of their own propositions (hence resulted **βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι**), or the nature of the great topics—Law, Philosophy, etc.—on which they dogmatised, hence their inconsistencies, **ἀντιθέσεις τοῦ ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως** (vi. 20). On the combination of the relative and interrogative pronouns in one sentence, see Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 211.

Vv. 8-11.. And yet this alleged antagonism of the Law to the Gospel is factitious: *the Law* on which they insist is part of law in general; so is the Gospel with which I was entrusted. The intention of both is to a large extent identical: to promote right conduct.

Ver. 8. **οἴδαμεν,** as in Rom. vii. 14. 1 Cor. viii. 1, 4, introduces a concession in the argument. **καλὸς ὁ νόμος** was a concession made by St. Paul, Rom. vii. 16, also Rom. vii. 12, **ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος.** It is possible that it had been objected that his language was inconsistent with his policy. It may be questioned whether **καλός,** in St. Paul's use of it, differs from **ἀγαθός,** as meaning good in appearance as well as in reality. For the use of **καλός** in the Pastorals, see notes on i. 18 and iii. 1. **τις** has no special reference to the teacher as distinct from the learner. The law is **καλός** in its own sphere; but *Corruptio optimi pessima;* "Sweetest things turn sourest by their deeds". **νομίμως** here means *in accordance with the spirit in which the law was enacted.* It does not mean *lawfully* in the usual acceptation of that term. St. Paul impresses the word into his service, and does it violence in order to give an epigrammatic turn to the sentence. In 2 Tim. ii. 5, **νομίμως** has its ordinary meaning *in accordance with the rules of the game.* **χρῆται**: In Euripides, *Hipp.* 98 **νόμοις χρῆσθαι** means "to live under laws".

Ver. 9. **εἰδώς** refers to **τις,** *as knowing this* (R.V.). For the expression *cf.* **οἶδας τοῦτο,** 2 Tim. i. 15 and Eph. v. 5. **νόμος**: Although **νόμος** when anarthrous may mean the Mosaic Law, the statement here is perfectly general (so R.V.). The Mosaic Law does not differ in the range of its application, though it may in the details of its enactments, from law in general, of which it is a subdivision. *Law is not enacted for*

κεῖται, [f] ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ [g] ἀνυποτάκτοις, [h] ἀσεβέσι [h] καὶ [h] ἁμαρτωλοῖς, [f] Mark xv. 28 (?) = Luke xxii. 37 = Is. liii. 12, Acts ii. 23, 1 Cor. ix. 21 (4), 2 Thess. ii. 8, 2 Pet. ii. 8. [g] Tit. i. 6, 10, Heb. ii. 8, not LXX. [h] Prov. xi. 31, 1 Pet. iv. 18. [i] 2 Tim. iii. 2, only, N.T. [k] 1 Tim. iv. 7, vi. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 16, Heb. xii. 6 only, N.T. [l] Here only, not LXX. [m] Here only, not LXX. [n] Here only N.T., 2 Macc. ix. 28. [o] 1 Cor. vi. 9, not LXX. [p] Here only, not LXX. [q] Rom. iii. 4, Tit. i. 12, Rev. xxi. 8? John (2), 1 John (5). [r] Here only N.T., *cf.* Matt. v. 33. [s] 2 Tim. iv. 3, Tit. i. 9, ii. 1, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 3, 2 Tim. i. 13, Tit. ii. 8, Tit. i. 13, ii. 2.

ἀνοσίοις καὶ [k] βεβήλοις, [l] πατρολῴαις καὶ [m] μητρολῴαις, [n] ἀνδροφόνοις, 10. πόρνοις, [o] ἀρσενοκοίταις, [p] ἀνδραποδισταῖς, [q] ψεύσταις, [r] ἐπιόρκοις, καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον τῇ [s] ὑγιαινούσῃ [s] διδασκαλίᾳ ἀντίκειται,

a naturally law-abiding man (dative of reference). **δίκαιος** is used here in the popular sense, as in "I came not to call the righteous". It is unnecessary to suppose that St. Paul had his theory of justification in his mind when writing this; though of course those who "are led by the Spirit" are **δίκαιοι** of the highest quality, **κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος** (Gal. v. 18 *sqq.*, 23). The enumeration of those whom legislators have in view when enacting laws naturally begins with **ἄνομοι,** of whom the **ἀνυπότακτοι,** *unruly*, those who deliberately rebel against restriction of any kind, are the extreme type. There is no special class or quality of crime involved in the terms **ἄνομος** and **ἀνυπότακτος.** As the series advances, the adjectives indicate more definite and restricted aspects of lawlessness: the first three pairs represent states of mind; then follow examples of violations of specific enactments. Since St. Paul is here dealing with the law of natural religion, it is not safe to deepen the shade of **ἀσεβής, κ.τ.λ.** by looking at the conceptions they express in the light of the Lord.

ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλός is a pair of epithets familiar from its occurrence in Prov. xi. 31 (quoted 1 Pet. iv. 18. See also Jude 15). The **ἀσεβής** is one whose mental attitude towards God Himself is that of deliberate irreverence; the **βέβηλος** acts contumeliously towards recognised expressions or forms of reverence to God.

Alford and Ellicott, following a hint from Bengel, suppose that in the series commencing **πατρολῴαις** St. Paul is going through the second table of the Decalogue. It is an argument against this that when St, Paul is unquestionably enumerating the Commandments, Rom. xiii. 9, he places the command against adultery before that against murder (so Luke xviii. 20; Jas ii. 11; Philo, *De Decalogo*, xxiv. and xxxii.; Tert. *de Pudic*, v., all following LXX (B) of Deut. chap. v.). There is therefore no necessity to give **πατρολῴας** the weak rendering *smiter of a father* (R.V. m.) in order to make the word refer to normal breaches of the Fifth Commandment, It can, of course, both by derivation and use, be so rendered, The Greek word, like *parricide* in Latin and English, may be applied to any unnatural treatment of a parent.

The apostle is here purposely specifying the most extreme violations of law, as samples (**καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον**) of what disregard of law may lead to. The healthy, wholesome teaching of Christ is of course in opposition to such enormities; it is also in opposition to the false teachers; these teachers have failed to attain to a pure heart, etc. Consequently, although professing to teach the Law, they find themselves in opposition to the essential spirit of law. Let them, and those who listen to them, take care lest their teaching inevitably issue in similar enormities.

Ver. 10. **ἀνδραποδισταῖς,** *plagiariis* (Vulg.), includes all who exploit other men and women for their own selfish ends; as **πόρνοις** and **ἀρσενοκοίταις** include all improper use of sexual relations.

διδασκαλία means *the body of doctrine*, the apostolic *Summa Theologiæ*. The noun is used absolutely, 1 Tim. vi. 1, or with varying epithets: **ὑγιαίνουσα,** *sana* (here, 2 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, ii. 1); **καλή,** *bona* (1 Tim. iv. 6); **κατ' εὐσέβειαν,** *secundum pietatem* (1 Tim. vi. 3); **μου** (2 Tim. iii. 10); **τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ** (Tit. ii. 10).

It means *the act of teaching* in Rom. xii. 7, xv. 4, 1 Tim. iv. 13, 16, v. 17, 2 Tim. iii. 16, Tit. ii. 7. The term occurs fifteen times in the Pastoral Epistles in a technical Christian sense. This is in the writer's mind even in 1 Tim. iv. 1, **διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων.** It is found four times in the other Pauline Epistles. Of these Rom. xii. 7 is the nearest approach to the special connotation here.

With **ὑγιαίνουσα** (see reff.) compare

t 1 Tim. vi. 11. κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ [t]μακαρίου Θεοῦ, ὃ [u]ἐπι-
15.
u Rom. iii. στεύθην ἐγώ. 12. [1v] Χάριν [v]ἔχω τῷ [w]ἐνδυναμώσαντί[2] με Χριστῷ
2, 1 Cor. ix. 17, Gal. [3]Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ὅτι [x]πιστόν με [x]ἡγήσατο, θέμενος εἰς
ii. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 4, Tit. i. 3.

v Luke xvii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 3, Heb. xii. 28. w Acts ix. 22, Rom. iv. 20, Eph. vi. 10, Phil. iv. 13, 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2 Tim. iv. 17. x Heb. xi. 11, *ef.* Acts xxvi. 2, Phil. ii. 3, 1 Thess. v. 13, 2 Thess. iii. 15.

[1] Ins. καὶ DKL, d, go., syrr.; om. καὶ ℵAFGP, 17, 31, 67**, 80, 238, five others, f, g, vg., boh., arm.

[2] ἐνδυναμοῦντι ℵ*, 2, 17, three others, Thphyl.

ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι (1 Tim. vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13), λόγος ὑγιής (Tit. ii. 8), and ὑγιαίνειν (ἐν) τῇ πίστει (Tit. i. 13, ii. 2).

The image is peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles; but it is not therefore un-Pauline, unless on the assumption that a writer never enlarges his vocabulary or ideas. *Healthy, wholesome* admirably describes Christian teaching, as St. Paul conceived it, in its complete freedom from casuistry or quibbles in its theory, and from arbitrary or unnatural restrictions in its practice. The terms νοσῶν as applied to false teaching (1 Tim. vi. 4), and possibly γάγγραινα (2 Tim. ii. 17) were suggested by contrast. See Dean Bernard's note on this verse.

Ver. 11. κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, κ.τ.λ., refers to the whole preceding sentence and is not to be connected with διδασκαλίᾳ only, which would necessitate τῇ κατὰ, κ.τ.λ. This reading is actually found in D,* *d, f, g*, Vg., Arm., *quae est secundum*, etc. Von Soden connects with δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται.

Inasmuch as unsound teaching had claimed to be a εὐαγγέλιον (Gal. i. 6), St. Paul finds it necessary to recharge the word with its old force by distinguishing epithets. εὐαγγέλιον had become impoverished by heterodox associations. The gospel with which St. Paul had been entrusted was *the gospel of the glory of the blessed God. Cf.* "the gospel of the glory of Christ," 2 Cor. iv. 4. *The gospel concerning the glory*, etc., *which reveals the glory*. And this glory, although primarily an attribute of God, is here and elsewhere treated as a blessed state to which those who obey the gospel may attain, and which it is possible to miss (Rom. iii. 23, v. 2, xv. 7. See Sanday and Headlam on Rom. iii. 23). The phrase is not, as in A.V., an expansion of "The gospel of God," Mark i. 14, etc., "the gospel of which God is the author," τῆς δόξης being a genitive of quality=*glorious*. (Compare Rom. viii. 21, 2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. i. 6, 18; Col. i. 11, 27; Tit. ii. 13).

μακαρίου: *Blessed* as an epithet of God is only found here and in vi. 15, where see note. Grimm compares the μάκαρες θεοί of Homer and Hesiod. But the notion here is much loftier. We may call God *blessed*, but not *happy*; since happiness is only predicated of those whom it is possible to conceive of as unhappy.

ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ: This phrase occurs again Tit. i. 3. *Cf.* Rom. iii. 2, 1 Cor. ix. 17, Gal. ii. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 4. St. Paul does not here allude to his particular presentation of the gospel, as in Gal. ii. 7; nor is he thinking specially of God's goodness to him in making him a minister, as in Rom. xv. 16, Eph. iii. 8, Col. i. 25; he is merely asserting his consistency, and repudiating the charge of antinomianism which had been brought against him.

Vv. 12-14. I cannot mention my part in the furtherance of the gospel without expressing my gratitude to our Lord for His forgiveness of my errors and His confidence in my natural trustworthiness, and His grace which gave me strength to serve Him.

Ver. 12. This parenthetical thanksgiving, which is quite in St. Paul's manner, is suggested by ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 9 *sqq.*, Eph. iii. 8.

χάριν ἔχω: see note on 2 Tim. i. 3.

ἐνδυναμώσαντι: The aor. is used because the writer's thoughts pass back to the particular time when he received inward strength increasingly, Acts ix. 22. In Phil. iv. 13 the present participle is appropriate, because he is describing his present state. The word ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι is only found in N.T. in Paul and Acts ix. 22. Is it fanciful to suppose that Luke's use of it in Acts was suggested by his master's account of that crisis?

ὅτι: *because.*

πιστόν: *trustworthy*, as a steward is expected to be, 1 Cor. iv. 2. See ref. There is, as Bengel remarks, a touch of ἀνθρωποπάθεια, of anthropomorphism or accommodation, in πιστόν με ἡγήσατο.

διακονίαν, 13. τὸ[1] πρότερον ὄντα[2] [y]βλάσφημον καὶ [a]διώκτην καὶ [y]2 Tim. iii. 2.
[a]ὑβριστήν· ἀλλὰ ἠλεήθην, ὅτι ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ· 14. [z]Here only, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 9, Gal. i. 13, 23, Phil. iii., 6, not LXX.
[b]ὑπερεπλεόνασεν δὲ ἡ χάρις [c]τοῦ [c]Κυρίου [e]ἡμῶν μετὰ [d]•[e]πίστεως
[d]•καὶ [d]•[e]ἀγάπης [d]τῆς [d]ἐν [d]Χριστῷ [d]Ἰησοῦ. 15. [f]Πιστὸς[3] [f]ὁ

a Rom. i. 30 only (N.T.). b Here only, not LXX. c 2 Tim. i. 8, Heb. vii. 14, 2 Pet. iii. 15, Rev. xi. 15. d 2 Tim. i. 13. e Col. i. 4, 1 Thess. iii. 6, v. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 15, vi. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 22, Tit. ii. 2, *cf.* Gal. v. 6, Eph. vi. 23, 1 Tim. iv. 12, Rev. ii. 19. f 1 Tim. iii. 1, iv. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 11, Tit. iii. 8, *cf.* Tit. i. 9, Rev. xxi. 5, xxii. 6.

[1] So ℵAD*FGP, 17, 47, 67**, 80, three others; τὸν DcKL.

[2] Ins. με A, 73, g.

[3] *Humanus* r, Latin MSS. known to Jerome, Ambrst., Julian pel., Aug.

The Divine Master *knew* that His steward Paul would be trustworthy. Paul, not unnaturally, speaks as if God's apprehension of him were of the same relative nature as his own *hope* of final perseverance.

θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν: The fact that Christ employed Paul in His service was a sufficient proof of His estimate of him. **διάκονος** and **διακονία** are used in a general sense of St. Paul's ministry also in Rom. xi. 13, 1 Cor. iii. 5, 2 Cor. iii. 6, iv. 1, v. 18, vi. 3, Eph. iii. 7, Col. i. 23, 25. *Cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 6, 2 Tim. iv. 5, 11. The nature of it is exactly defined in Acts xx. 24, "to testify the gospel of the grace of God".

Ver. 13. **ὄντα**: concessive: "*though I was*," etc. **βλάσφημον**: *a blasphemer*. The context alone can decide whether **βλασφημεῖν** is to be rendered *rail* or *blaspheme*. It was against Jesus personally that Paul had acted (Acts ix. 5, xxii. 7, xxvi. 14). This brings into stronger relief the kindness of Jesus to Paul. **ὑβριστής**, rendered *insolent* (R.V.), Rom. i. 30, covers both words and deeds of despitefulness. *Injurious* is sufficiently comprehensive, but, in modern English, is not sufficiently vigorous.

ἀλλὰ ἠλεήθην: *Obtaining mercy* does not in this case mean the pardon which implies merely exemption from punishment; no self-respecting man would value such a relationship with God. Rather St. Paul has in his mind what he has expressed elsewhere as the issue of having received mercy, *viz.*, to have been granted an opportunity of serving Him whom he had injured. *Cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 25, xv. 10, 2 Cor. iv. 1.

ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα: A possible echo of the Saying from the Cross recorded in Luke xxiii. 34, **οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν**. See also John xv. 21, xvi. 3, Acts iii. 17, xiii. 27, 1 Cor. ii. 8. There is a remarkable parallel in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Judah xix. 3, **ἠλέησέ με ὅτι ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ τοῦτο ἐποίησα**) dated by Charles between 109-106 B.C.

ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ does not so much qualify **ἀγνοῶν**, as correct a possible notion that all ignorance must be excusable. St. Paul declares, on the contrary, that his was a positive act of sinful disbelief; but "where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly," **ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις**, Rom. v. 20.

Ver. 14. **ὑπερπλεονάζειν** only occurs here in N.T.; but St. Paul constantly uses compounds with **ὑπέρ**. The comparative force of the **ὑπέρ**—grace outweighing sin—is brought out in Rom. v. 15 *sqq*. In these passages at least it is not true, as Ellicott maintains, that **ὑπέρ** has a superlative (*abound exceedingly*) force.

τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν: The expression *our Lord* (without the addition of *Jesus* or *Jesus Christ*), common in modern times, is rare in N.T. See reff. In 2 Peter iii. 15 it is not certain if the reference is to Christ, the Judge, or to the Father who determines the moment of His coming. In Rev. xi. 15 God the Father is meant.

Faith and love which is in Christ Jesus occurs again in 2 Tim. i. 13. In both places the singular relative is improperly used for the plural. It is one of the writer's habitual phrases; and therefore we cannot suppose any special relevance to the context in either of its constituent parts, though here Bengel contrasts *faith* with the *unbelief*; and *love* with the *blasphemer*, etc., of ver. 13. *Faith and love*, are the inward and outward manifestations respectively of the bestowal and realisation of grace.

πίστις ἐν Χρ.Ἰησ. occurs Gal. iii. 26, 1 Tim. iii. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 15. **πίστις** and **ἀγάπη** are also associated (in this order) in the first six reff.

Vv. 15-17. The dealings of Christ with me, of course, are not unique. My ex-

g 1 Tim. iv. 9 only, not LXX. h h John i. 9, iii. 19, vi. 14, ix. 39, xi. 27, xii. 46, xvi. 28, xviii. 37.

g λόγος καὶ πάσης g ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος, ὅτι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς h ἦλθεν h εἰς τὸν h κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι· ὧν πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ. 16. ἀλλὰ

perience is the same in kind, though not in degree, as that of all saved sinners. Christ's longsuffering will never undergo a more severe test than it did in my case, so that no sinner need ever despair. Let us glorify God therefor.

Ver. 15. **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος**: The complete phrase, **πιστὸς . . . ἄξιος** recurs in 1 Tim. iv. 9; and **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος** in 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2 Tim. ii. 11, Tit. iii. 8.

The only other places in the N.T. in which **πιστὸς** is applied to **λόγος** in the sense of *that can be relied on* are Tit. i. 9, **ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου**; Rev. xxi. 5, xxii. 6, **οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί.**

In Tit. i. 9 the **πιστὸς λόγος** cannot mean an isolated saying, but rather the to ality of the revelation given in Christ. Of the other five places in which the phrase occurs there are not more than two in which it is possible to say with confidence that a definite saying is referred to, *i.e.*, here, and perhaps 2 Tim. ii. 11. In the other passages, the expression seems to be a brief parenthetical formula, affirmative of the truth of the general doctrine with which the writer happens to be dealing. See notes in each place.

πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος: Field (*Notes on Trans. N.T.* p. 203) shows by many examples from Diodorus Siculus and Diog. Laert. that this phrase was a common one in later Greek. He would render **ἀποδοχή** by *approbation* or *admiration*. See also Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 185. **ἀπόδεκτος** occurs 1 Tim. ii. 3, v. 4; **ἀποδέχεσθαι** in Luke and Acts.

Other examples in the Pastorals of the use of **πᾶς** (=*summus*) with abstract nouns (besides ch. iv. 9) are 1 Tim. ii. 2, 11, iii. 4, v. 2, vi. 1, 2 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. ii. 10, 15, iii. 2.

Χρ. Ἰησ. ἦλθεν—σῶσαι: This is quite evidently a saying in which the apostolic church summed up its practical belief in the Incar ation. **ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον**, as used of Christ, is an expression of the Johannine theology; see reff. It is the converse of another Johannine expression, **ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς . . .** (*or* **ὁ πατὴρ**) **εἰς τὸν κόσμον**: John iii. 17, x. 36, xvii. 18, 1 John iv. 9. **εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον** is used in the same association, Heb. x. 5. **εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον** is used of sin, Rom. v. 12; **ἐξέρχεσθαι εἰς τ. κ.** of false prophets in 1 John iv. 1, 2 John 7.

When we say that this is a Johannine expression, we do not mean that the writer of this epistle was influenced by the Johannine *literature*. But until it has been proved that John the son of Zebedee did not write the Gospel which bears his name, and that the discourses contained in it are wholly unhistorical, we are entitled, indeed compelled, to assume that what we may for convenience call Johannine theology, and the familiar expression of it, was known wherever John preached.

With **ἦλθεν . . . σῶσαι** *cf.* Luke xix. 10, **ἦλθεν . . . σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.** For the notion expressed in **ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι** *cf.* Matt. i. 21, ix. 13; see also John xii. 47, **ἦλθον . . . ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον**; John i. 29, **ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου**; and 1 John ii. 2.

The pre-existence of Christ, as well as His resistless power to save, is of course assumed in this noble summary of the gospel.

ὧν πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ: In the experiences of personal religion each individual man is alone with God. He sees nought but the Holy One and his own sinful self (*cf.* Luke xviii. 13, **μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ**). And the more familiar a man becomes with the meeting of God face to face the less likely is he to be deceived as to the gulf which parts him, limited, finite, defective, from the Infinite and Perfect. It is not easy to think of anyone but St. Paul as penning these words; although his expressions of self-depreciation elsewhere (1 Cor. xv. 9, Eph. iii. 8) are quite differently worded. In each case the form in which they are couched arises naturally out of the context. The sincerity of St. Paul's humility is proved by the fact that he had no mock modesty; when the occasion compelled it, he could appraise himself; *e.g.*, Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16, 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11, Gal. ii. 6.

Ver. 16. **ἀλλά**: This is not adversative, but rather continues from ver. 13, and develops the expression of self-depreciation. The connexion is: "I was such a sinner that antecedently one might doubt

διὰ τοῦτο ἠλεήθην, ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ πρώτῳ [i] ἐνδείξηται Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς [1] τὴν [k] ἅπασαν [k] μακροθυμίαν, πρὸς [l] ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰς [m] ζωὴν [m] αἰώνιον. 17. τῷ δὲ [n] βασιλεῖ [n] τῶν [k] [n] αἰώνων, [o] ἀφθάρτῳ,[2] [p] ἀοράτῳ, [q] μόνῳ [3] θεῷ, τιμὴ καὶ δόξα εἰς τοὺς

(of God) Rom. ix. 17, 22, Eph. ii. 7. 2 Tim. iv. 2, *cf.* Col. i. 11, see 2 Tim. iii. 10.

1 2 Tim. i. 13 only, not LXX. vi. 12, Tit i. 2, iii. 7, etc. xii. 1, xviii. 4, Rom. i. 23.
m John iv. 14, 36, vi. 27, xii. 25, Acts xiii. 48, Rom. v. 21, 1 Tim. vi. 12, Tit i. 2, iii. 7, etc.
n Tob. xiii. 6, 10, Enoch ix. 4, Rev. xv. 3, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 15.
o Wisd. xii. 1, xviii. 4, Rom. i. 23.
p Col. i. 15, Heb. xi. 27.
q John v. 44. Jude 25.

[1] So AD, 17, 47, 80, six others, d, f, r, vg., go., sah.; Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵKLP, 37, syrr., boh., arm.

[2] ἀθανάτῳ D*, *immortali* d, f, r, vg., go., syrhcl-mg; FG, g, r (*incorruptibili*) add ἀθανάτῳ after ἀοράτῳ.

[3] Ins. σοφῷ ℵcDbcKLP, go., syrhcl (from Rom. xvi. 27); om. σοφῷ ℵ*AD*FG, 17, 37, one other, Latt., sah., boh., syrpesh.

whether I could be saved or was worth saving. But Christ had a special object in view in extending to me His mercy."

διὰ τοῦτο, followed by **ἵνα** and referring to what follows, occurs in Rom. iv. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 10, Eph. vi. 13, 2 Thess. ii. 11, Philem. 15. See also Rom. xiii. 6. **ἐν ἐμοί** is used as in Gal. i. 16, 24, and as **ἐν ἡμῖν** in 1 Cor. iv. 6. *I was an object lesson* in which Christ displayed the extent of His longsuffering.

πρώτῳ: Alford correctly says that the foll. **μελλόντων** proves that St. Paul here combines the senses *first* (A.V.) and *as chief* (R.V.).

τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν: *the utmost longsuffering which he has* (Blass, *Grammar*, p. 162). Here 1 renders **μακροθ.** *longanimitatem.* Chrys., followed by Alf. and Ell., explains, "Greater longsuffering He could not show in any case than in mine, nor find a sinner that so required *all* His longsuffering; not a part only". If there had been only one soul of sinful man to save, it would have needed the Incarnation to save that soul. In St. Paul's case, conversion had been preceded by a long internal struggle on his part, and patience on Christ's part: "It is hard for thee to kick against the goad". **ἅπας** only occurs in the Pauline epistles again in Eph. vi. 13. Its use "is confined principally to literary documents" (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii. vi. 88).

πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελλόντων: The use of the genitive here is paralleled exactly in 2 Peter ii 6, **ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν**, "an example unto those that should live ungodly"; and 1 Cor. x. 6, **ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν**; also 1 Tim. iv. 12, where see reff. It does not mean as R.V. (*an ensample of them*), that St. Paul was the first specimen of Jesus' work of grace, but rather as A.V. (*a pattern to them*), that no one who ever afterwards hears the gracious invitation of Christ need hang back from accepting it by reason of the greatness of his sin, when he has the example of St. Paul before him (so Chrys.). The **ὑποτύπωσις**, of course, is the whole transaction of St. Paul's conversion in all its bearings, *ad informationem eorum qui crediturī sunt illi* (Vulg.). Bengel compares Ps. xxxii. 5, 6, "Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. For this let every one that is godly pray unto thee," etc.

πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ: **πιστεύειν** is usually followed by **εἰς** and the acc., or the simple dat. But **ἐπί** with acc., and **ἐν** are also found. The construction in the text is due to an unconscious recollection of Isaiah xxviii. 16 (also quoted Rom. ix. 33, x. 11, 1 Peter ii. 6); and no other explanation need be sought. The only other certain instance of the same construction is Luke xxiv. 25. The critical editors reject it in Matt. xxvii. 42.

Ver. 17. This noble doxology might be one used by St. Paul himself in one of his eucharistic prayers. It is significant that in the Jewish forms of thanksgiving מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם is of constant occurrence. See reff., and **θεὸς τῶν αἰ.** in Ecclus. xxxvi. 22. Bengel's suggestion (on ch. i. 4) that there is a polemical reference to the aeons of Gnosticism is fanciful and unnecessary. **βασιλεύς**, as a title of God the Father, is found in vi. 15 and Rev. xv. 3, a passage of which Swete says (*comm.* in loc.), "The thought as well as the phraseology of the Song is strangely Hebraic". *Cf.* Ps. ix. 37 (x. 16).

ἀφθάρτῳ: The three adjectives **ἀφθά-**

r See ver. 5. αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν. 18. Ταύτην τὴν [r]παραγγελίαν [s]παρα-
s Luke xii. 48, xxiii. 46, Acts xiv. 23, xx. 32, 2 Tim. ii. 2, 1 Pet. iv. 19.
τίθεμαί σοι, [t]τέκνον Τιμόθεε, κατὰ τὰς [u]προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφη-
t See ver. 2. u 1 Tim. v. 24.

ρτῳ, ἀοράτῳ, μόνῳ are co-ordinate epithets of θεῷ, *to God immortal, invisible, unique.*

ἄφθαρτος, *immortal*, as an epithet of God, occurs Rom. i. 23 (*cf.* Wisd. xii. 1, τὸ γὰρ ἄφθαρτόν σου . . . πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἐν πᾶσιν, and Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 376). It is expanded in vi. 15 *sq.*, *who only hath immortality*, just as ἀοράτῳ becomes *whom no man hath seen, nor can see* (for the thought, see John i. 18, Col. i. 15, Heb. xi. 27, 1 John iv. 12), and μόνῳ becomes *the blessed and only potentate.* For the epithet μόνος, used absolutely, see reff. and also Ps. lxxxvi. 10, John xvii. 3, Rom. xvi. 27.

τιμὴ καὶ δόξα: This combination in a doxology is found Rev. iv. 9, δώσουσιν . . . δόξαν καὶ τιμήν; v. 13, ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα. In St. Paul's other doxologies (Gal. i. 5, Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, Phil. iv. 20, Eph. iii. 21, 1 Tim. vi. 16, 2 Tim. iv. 18), with the exception of 1 Tim. vi. 16 (τιμὴ καὶ κράτος), τιμή is not found; and he always has ἡ δόξα (see Westcott, Additional Note on Heb. xiii. 21).

Vv. 18-20. The charge that I am giving you now is in harmony with what you heard from the prophets at your ordination. It only emphasises the fundamental moral relations of man to things unseen and seen. The rejection of these principles of natural religion naturally issues in a perversion of revealed religion, such as caused the excommunication of Hymenaeus and Alexander.

Ver. 18. ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν is partly resumptive of ver. 3; it is the positive aspect of what is there negatively expressed; but as it concerns Timothy directly, it has a reference forward to ἵνα στρατεύῃ, κ.τ.λ., and to the general contents of the epistle. Bengel refers it to παραγγελίας, ver. 5. Peile to πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, κ.τ.λ.

παρατίθεμαί σοι: The use of this word, as in Luke xii. 48, 2 Tim. ii. 2, suggests that the παραγγελία is more than an injunction of temporary urgency, that it is connected with, if not the same as, the παραθήκη (*depositum*) of 1 Tim. vi. 20, etc.

τέκνον Τιμόθεε: There is a peculiar affectionate earnestness in this use of the personal name, here and in the conclusion of the letter (vi. 20). *Cf.* Luke x. 41, *Martha, Martha;* xxii. 34, *Peter;* John xiv. 9, *Philip;* xx. 16, *Mary.* For τέκνον see note on ver. 2.

κατὰ τὰς . . . προφητείας, κ.τ.λ.: By the prophecies, etc., are meant the utterances of the prophets, such as Silas (and not excluding St. Paul himself) who were with St. Paul when the ordination of Timothy became possible; utterances which pointed out the young man as a person suitable for the ministry, *led the way to* him (R.V.m.). So Chrys. There is no need to suppose that any long interval of time elapsed between the first prophetical utterances and the laying on of hands. In any case, similar prophecies accompanied the act of ordination. This explanation agrees best with the order of the words, and is in harmony with earlier and later references to the extraordinary function of prophets in relation to the ministry in the apostolic church. Thus in Acts xiii. 1, 2, the imposition of hands on Paul and Barnabas—whether for a special mission or to a distinct order it matters not—was at the dictation of prophets. And Clem. Alex. (*Quis Dives*, 42) speaks of the Apostle John, κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος σημαινομένων. In the same sense may be understood Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 42: οἱ ἀπόστολοι . . . καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους.

It is evident from iv. 14 that the prophecy accompanying the laying-on of hands was considered at least contributory to the bestowal of the charisma; it is natural to suppose that it was of the nature of a charge to the candidate. St. Paul here says that his present charge to Timothy is *in accordance with, in the spirit of, and also in reinforcement of* (ἵνα στρατεύῃ ἐν αὐταῖς) the charge he had originally received on an occasion of peculiar solemnity. This is a stimulating appeal like that of 2 Tim. iii. 14, "knowing of whom thou hast learned them".

Ellicott disconnects προαγούσας from ἐπὶ σέ; but "forerunning, precursory," is pointless as an epithet of predictions, though quite appropriate as applied to ἐντολή in Heb. vii. 18; and the notion

τείας, ἵνα [v]στρατεύῃ [1] ἐν αὐταῖς τὴν καλὴν [w]στρατείαν, 19. ἔχων [x]πίστιν καὶ [x]ἀγαθὴν [x]συνείδησιν, ἣν τινες [y]ἀπωσάμενοι [z]περὶ [z]τὴν [z]πίστιν [a]ἐναυάγησαν· 20. ὧν ἐστὶν [c]Ὑμέναιος καὶ [d]Ἀλέξανδρος, οὓς [b]παρέδωκα [b]τῷ [b]Σατανᾷ ἵνα [c]παιδευθῶσι μὴ [d]βλασφημεῖν.

v 1 Cor. ix. 7, 2 Cor. x. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 4.
w 2 Cor. x. 4.
x See ver. 5.
y Acts xiii. 46.
z 1 Tim. vi. 21, 2 Tim. iii. 8. 22, xxii. 3, 1 Cor. xi. 32, 2 Cor. vi. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 25, Tit. ii. 12.
a 2 Cor. xi. 25 only, not LXX.
b 1 Cor. v. 5.
c Acts vii. xxvi. 65, John x. 36, Acts xiii. 45, xviii. 6, xxvi. 11.
d Matt. ix. 3 = Mark ii. 7, Matt.

[1] στρατεύσῃ ℵ*D*.

of "prophecies uttered over Timothy at his ordination . . . foretelling his future zeal and success" is unnatural.

ἵνα στρατεύῃ . . . τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν: The ministry is spoken of as *a warfare, militia*, "the service of a **στρατιώτης** in all its details and particulars" (Ell.). See reff., and an interesting parallel in 4 Macc. ix. 23, **ἱερὰν κ. εὐγενῆ στρατείαν στρατεύσασθε περὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας.**

ἐν αὐταῖς: *in them*, as in defensive armour. (Winer Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 484). *Cf.* Eph. vi. 14, 16, for a similar use of **ἐν**.

καλός is characteristic of the Pastorals, in which it occurs twenty-four times as against sixteen times in the other Pauline Epistles. It has a special Christian reference in such phrases as the present, and as qualifying **στρατιώτης**, 2 Tim. ii. 3; **ἀγών**, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 7; **διδασκαλία**, 1 Tim. iv. 6; **ὁμολογία**, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13: **παραθήκη**, 2 Tim. i. 14; **διάκονος**, 1 Tim. iv. 6. Moreover, the use of the word in these epistles is also different from that found in the earlier epistles: (*a*) it is used as a qualifying adjective twelve times in the Pastorals (excluding **καλὸν ἔργον, καλὰ ἔργα**) *viz.*, in addition to the reff. already given, 1 Tim. iii. 7, 13, vi. 19. This use is not found in the other Pauline Epistles. (*b*) As a predicate it occurs twice, *viz.*, 1 Tim. i. 8, iv. 4, as against once elsewhere in Paul, Rom. vii. 16. On the other hand, **τὸ καλόν** is not found in the Pastorals, though five times elsewhere (Rom. vii. 18, 21; 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Gal. vi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 21); nor **καλά** (Rom. xii. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 21); nor **καλόν** (Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. v. 6, vii. 1, 8, 26, ix. 15; Gal. iv. 18); but **τοῦτο καλόν** occurs chap. ii. 3 (Tit. iii. 8) as well as in 1 Cor. vii. 26. See also note on chap. iii. 1.

Ver. 19. **ἔχων**: It is best perhaps to suppose that the metaphor of warfare is not continued beyond **στρατείαν**; else we might render, *holding faith*, as a shield, *cf.* Eph. vi. 16. But **ἐν αὐταῖς** implies that the prophecies included every piece of defensive armour. So **ἔχων** here simply means *possessing*, as in 1 Tim. iii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 13, iii. 5, Rom. ii. 20, 1 Cor. xv. 34, 1 Pet. iii. 16. **συνείδησιν**: see note on ver. 5.

τινες: see note on ver. 3.

ἀπωσάμενοι: The indictment against the moral standard of the false teachers is here expressed more severely than above in ver. 6. There they are said to have "missed" or "neglected" faith, etc.; but here that they *thrust it from them* (R.V., *cf.* Acts xiii. 46) when it importuned for admittance into their hearts. "Recedit invita. Semper dicit, Noli me laedere" (Bengel).

περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν: Another change of metaphor: *they suffered moral shipwreck, so far as the faith is concerned.* "When the life is corrupt, it engenders a doctrine congenial to it" (Chrys.). We are not justified in interpreting *suffered shipwreck* as though it meant that they were lost beyond hope of recovery. St. Paul himself had suffered shipwreck at least four times (2 Cor. xi. 25) when he wrote this epistle. He had on each occasion lost everything except himself. For the construction, *cf.* **περὶ τὴν πίστιν [ἀλήθειαν] ἠστόχησαν**, 1 Tim. vi. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 18; **ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν**, 2 Tim. iii. 8. **περί** with acc. is used in a somewhat similar sense in Mark iv. 19, Luke x. 40, 41, Acts xix. 25, Phil. ii. 23 (the only instance in Paul outside the Pastorals) 1 Tim. vi. 4, Tit. ii. 7.

Hymenaeus and Alexander were the ringleaders of those who had suffered shipwreck. There is no sufficient reason to suppose that this Hymenaeus is different from the heretic of the same name in 2 Tim. ii. 17, where his error is more precisely defined. The identification of Alexander with Alexander the smith of 2 Tim. iv. 14 is more precarious.

Ver. 20. **οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ**: *I have delivered* (A.V.) expresses more

II. 1. [a]Παρακαλῶ[1] [a]οὖν πρῶτον πάντων [b]ποιεῖσθαι [b]δεήσεις, προσευχάς, [c]ἐντεύξεις, [d]εὐχαριστίας, ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων·—

[a] Rom. xii. 1, 1 Cor. iv. 16, Eph. iv. 1. [b] Luke v. 33, Phil. i. 4. [c] 2 Macc. iv. 8, 1 Tim. iv. 5. [d] 1 Cor. xiv. 16, Phil. iv. 6.

[1] παρακάλει, *obsecra*, D*FgrG, d, g (not r), sah.

accurately than *I delivered* (R.V.) the force of the aorist followed by the subjunctive: they were still under sentence of excommunication (see Field *in loc.*). The theory of the relation of the Church to non-Christians which underlies this phrase is expressed in 1 John v. 19, **ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ὅλος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται.** The **ἐξουσία τοῦ Σατανᾶ** was "the darkness" over against "the light" of the Kingdom of God (Acts xxvi. 18). The conception is not popular among modern Christians. The two kingdoms, if there are two, have interpenetrated each other. The phraseology, here and in the parallel, 1 Cor. v. 5, is based on Job ii. 6, **ἰδοὺ παραδίδωμί σοι αὐτόν.** The name **Σατανᾶς** also occurs in chap. v. 15 and in eight other places in the Pauline Epistles.

ἵνα παιδευθῶσι: The apostolic severity was not merely punitive; it was also corrective. The intention, at least, of excommunication was **ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ**, 1 Cor. v. 5. So Chrys. We must not therefore render here, sarcastically, *that they may learn*, A.V., but *that they might be taught* or *instructed*. At the same time, it is unnatural to assume with Bengel that the **παιδεία** was intended to keep them from blaspheming at all; St. Paul hoped that it might prevent a repetition of the sin. The term has more of the association of discipline here and in 1 Cor. xi. 32, 2 Cor. vi. 9, than in the other references.

βλασφημεῖν: It is absurd to suppose that St. Paul here refers to a railing disparagement of his own apostolic claims.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-7. In the first place, let me remind you that the Church's public prayers must be made expressly for all men, from the Emperor downwards. This care for all becomes those who know that they are children of a Father who wishes the best for all His children. He is one and the same to all, and the salvation He has provided in the Atonement is available for all. My own work among the Gentiles is one instance of God's fetching home again His banished ones.

Ver. 1. **παρακαλῶ οὖν**: This is resumptive of, and a further development of the **παραγγελία** of i. 18. See reff. St. Paul here at last begins the subject matter of the letter. The object of **παρακαλῶ** is not expressed; it is the Church, through Timothy.

πρῶτον πάντων is to be connected with **παρακαλῶ**: *The most important point in my exhortation concerns the universal scope of public prayer.* The A.V. connects **πρῶτ. πάντ.** with **ποιεῖσθαι**, as though the framing of a liturgy were in question.

ποιεῖσθαι is mid. The mid. of **ποιεῖν** is not of frequent occurrence in N.T.; it is found chiefly in Luke and Paul. For the actual expression **δεήσεις ποιεῖσθαι**, see reff., and Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 320, note, and Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 250.

There is of course a distinction in meaning between **δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις,** *supplications* (in special crises) *prayers, petitions*; that is to say, they cannot be used interchangeably on every occasion; but here the nuances of meaning are not present to St. Paul's mind: his object in the enumeration is simply to cover every possible variety of public prayer. This is proved conclusively by the addition **εὐχαριστίας,** which of course could not be, in any natural sense, for all men. But every kind of prayer must be accompanied by thanksgiving, Phil. iv. 6, Col. iv. 2. On **ἔντευξις**, see Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 284, and Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 121. The retention of *thanksgivings* in the reference to this verse in the opening of the Anglican prayer *For the whole state of Christ's Church* is scarcely justified by referring it to God's triumphs of grace in the lives of the faithful departed. Less unnatural is the explanation of Chrysostom, that "we must give thanks to God for the good that befals others".

προσευχή and **δέησις** (in this order) are combined, Eph. vi. 18, Phil. iv. 6; and in chap. v. 5 in the same order as here.

ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων: The blessed effects of intercessory prayer on those who pray and on those for whom prayer

2. ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν [c]ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων, ἵνα [f]ἤρεμον καὶ [g]ἡσύχιον [h]βίον [i]διάγωμεν ἐν πάσῃ [k]εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ [l]σεμνότητι· e 2 Macc. iii. 11, 1 Cor. ii. 1. f Es. iii. 13 only.

g 1 Pet. iii. 4. h Luke viii. 14, 2 Tim. ii. 4, 1 John ii. 16. i Ecclus. xxxviii. 27, 2 Macc. xii. 38, 3 Macc. i. 3, iv. 8, vi. 35, Tit. iii. 3. k Acts iii. 12, 1 Tim. iii. 16, iv. 7, 8, vi. 3, 5, 6, 11, 2 Tim. iii. 5, Tit. i. 1, 2 Pet. i. 3, 6, 7, iii. 11. l 2 Macc. iii. 12, 1 Tim. iii. 4, Tit. ii. 7.

is made is urged with special reference to the circumstances of the early Church by Polycarp, *Phil.* 12; Tert. *Apol.* § 30; *ad Scapulam*, § 2; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 17; *Dial.* 35. "No one can feel hatred towards those for whom he prays. . . . Nothing is so apt to draw men under teaching, as to love and be loved" (Chrys.).

Ver. 2. **ὑπὲρ βασιλέων**: Prayer for all men must be given intensity and directness by analysis into prayer for each and every sort and condition of men. St. Paul begins such an analytical enumeration with *kings and all that are in high place;* but he does not proceed with it. This verse 2 is in fact an explanatory parenthesis, exemplifying how the prayer "for all men" is to begin. The plural *kings* has occasioned some difficulty; since in St. Paul's time, Timothy and the Ephesian Church were concerned with one king only, the Emperor. Consequently those who deny the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals suppose that the writer here betrays his consciousness of the associated emperors under the Antonines. But, in the first place, he would have written **τῶν βασιλέων**: and again, the sentiment was intended as a perfectly general one, applicable to all lands. St. Paul knew of kingdoms outside the Roman empire to which, no doubt, he was sure the Gospel would spread; and even within the Roman empire there were honorary **βασιλεῖς** whose characters could seriously affect those about them. The plural is similarly used in Matt. x. 18 and parallels.

On the duty of prayer for kings see Jer. xxix. 7, Ezra vi. 10, Bar. i. 11, 1 Macc. vii. 33, Rom. xiii. 1, Tit. iii. 1, 1 Pet. ii. 13.

Such prayer was a prominent feature in the Christian liturgy from the earliest times to which we can trace it (*e.g.*, Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 61). It is specially noted in the Apologies as a proof of the loyalty of Christians to the Government, *e.g.*, Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 17; Tert. *Apol.* 30, 31, 39; Athenagoras, *Legatio*, p. 39. Origen, *Cont. Cels.* viii. 12.

ἐν ὑπεροχῇ: *in high place* (R.V.). The noun occurs in an abstract sense, **καθ' ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας**, 1 Cor. ii. 1; but the verb is found in this association: Rom. xiii. 1, **ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις**; 1 Pet. ii. 13, **βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι**. The actual phrase **τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων** is found in an inscription at Pergamum "after 133 B.C." (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 255).

ἵνα ἤρεμον: This expresses not the reason why prayer was to be made for kings, but the purport of the prayer itself. *Cf.* Tert. *Apol.* 39, "Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministeriis eorum ac potestatibus, pro statu seculi, pro rerum quiete". So Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 60, **δὸς ὁμόνοιαν καὶ εἰρήνην ἡμῖν . . .[ὥστε σώζεσθαι ἡμᾶς] ὑπηκόους γινομένους . . . τοῖς ἄρχουσιν καὶ ἡγουμένοις ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**, and esp. § 61. Von Soden connects **ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.** with **παρακαλῶ**.

ἤρεμος and **ἡσύχιος**, *tranquil and quiet* (R.V.), perhaps refer to inward and outward peace respectively. See Bengel, on 1 Pet. iii. 4. **ἡσυχία** also has an external reference where it occurs in N.T., Acts xxii. 2, 2 Thess. iii. 12, 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12. **ἠρεμέω** is found in a papyrus of ii. A.D. cited by Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 471.

διάγω is used in the sense of *passing one's life*, absolutely, without **βίον** expressed, in Tit. iii. 3.

ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ κ. σεμνότητι: *with as much piety and earnestness* or *seriousness as is possible.* This clause, as Chrys. points out, qualifies the prayer for a tranquil and quiet life. **εὐσέβεια** and **σεμνότης**, *piety* and *seriousness*, belong to the vocabulary of the Pastoral Epistles, though **εὐσ.** occurs elsewhere; see reff. In the Pastorals **εὐσέβεια** is almost a technical term for *the Christian religion as expressed in daily life.* It is used with a more general application, *religious conduct*, in 1 Tim. vi. 11 and in 2 Peter. It and its cognates were "familiar terms in the religious language of the Imperial period" (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 364). **σεμνότης** is rather *gravitas*, as Vulg. renders it in Tit. ii. 7, than *castitas* (Vulg. here and 1 Tim. iii. 4) just as **σεμνός** is a wider term than *pudicus* as Vulg. always renders it (Phil. iv. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 11; Tit. ii. 2). The

m 1 Cor. vii. 26, *cf.* Tit. iii. 8. n 1 Tim. v. 4 only, not LXX. o Rom. xiv. 22, 1 Cor. i. 29, 2 Cor. iv. 2, vii. 12, Gal. i. 20, 1 Tim. v. 4, 21, vi. 13, 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1, *cf.* Rom. iii. 20, 2 Cor. viii. 21. p See 1 Tim. i. 1. q 2 Tim. ii. 25, iii. 7, Tit. i. 1, Heb. x. 26, *cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 3. r Gal. iii. 19, 20, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24.

m τοῦτο [1] m καλὸν καὶ n ἀπόδεκτον o ἐνώπιον o τοῦ p σωτῆρος p ἡμῶν o p Θεοῦ, 4. ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς q ἐπίγνωσιν q ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν. 5. Εἷς γὰρ Θεός, εἷς καὶ r μεσίτης

[1] Ins. γὰρ ℵcDFGKLP, d, f, g, m^{101}, r, vg. (*enim*), go., syrr., arm.; om. γὰρ ℵ*A, 17, 67**, boh., sah.

A.V. *honesty* is an older English equivalent for *seemliness*. σεμνός and σεμνότης connote gravity which compels genuine respect.

Ver. 3. τοῦτο: *i.e.*, prayer for all men.

καλόν: not to be joined with ἐνώπιον, but taken by itself, as in reff. See note on i. 18. ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ occurs again, v. 4. *Prayer for all men approves itself to the natural conscience, and it is also in accordance with the revealed will of God.*

θεοῦ is almost epexegetical of σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. *Our Saviour*, if it stood alone, might mean Christ; but it is God the Father that is the originating cause of salvation. See note on i. 1.

Ver. 4. "The grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men" (Tit. ii. 11) as was foreshadowed in the O.T.; *e.g.* Ps. lxvii. 2, "Thy saving health among all nations". God is, so far as His inclination or will is concerned, "the Saviour of all men," but actually, so far as we can affirm with certainty, "of them that believe" (1 Tim. iv. 10). These *He saved*, ἔσωσεν (2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. iii. 5), *i.e.*, *placed in a state of being saved*. But here St. Paul does not say θέλει σῶσαι, but θέλει σωθῆναι; for by His own limitation of His powers, so far as they are perceived by us, the salvation of men does not depend on God alone. It depends on the exercise of the free will of each individual in the acceptance or rejection of salvation (so Wiesinger, quoted by Alf.; and, as Bengel notes on ἐλθεῖν, *non coguntur*), as well as on the co-operation of those who pray for all men; and, by so doing, generate a spiritual atmosphere in which the designs of God may grow.

It is also to be observed that since *salvation* means *a state of being saved*, there is no difficulty in *the knowledge of the truth* following it in the sentence, as though it were a consequence rather than a precedent condition. This is indeed the order indicated in the Last Commission: "baptising them . . . teaching them" (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). So that there is no need to suppose with Ell., that καὶ εἰς . . . ἐλθεῖν was "suggested by . . . the enunciation of the great truth which is contained in the following verse".

εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν: This whole phrase recurs in 2 Tim. iii. 7. For ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας see reff. In Heb. x. 26 both words have the article. It has been shown by Dean Armitage Robinson (*Ephesians*, p. 248 *sqq.*) that ἐπίγνωσις is not *maior exactiorque cognitio;* but, as distinguished from γνῶσις "which is the wider word and expresses 'knowledge' in the fullest sense, ἐπίγνωσις is knowledge directed towards a particular object, perceiving, discerning, recognising". *Cf.* 2 Macc. ix. 11, ἤρξατο . . . εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἔρχεσθαι. ἀληθεία occurs fourteen times in the Pastorals; and often with a special Christian reference, like ὁδός and εὐσέβεια. See *e.g.* in addition to this place, 1 Tim. iii. 15, iv. 3, vi. 5, 2 Tim. ii. 15, 18, iii. 8, iv. 4, Tit. i. 14. It is a term that belongs to the Johannine theology as well as to the Pauline.

Ver. 5. This emphatic statement as to the unity of the Godhead is suggested by the singular σωτῆρος just preceding. The εἷς neither affirms nor denies anything as to the complexity of the nature of the Godhead; it has no bearing on the Christian doctrine of the Trinity; it simply is intended to emphasise the uniqueness of the relations of God to man. The use of *one*, with this intention, is well illustrated by Eph. iv. 4-6, ἓν σῶμα, κ.τ.λ. The current thought of the time was conscious of many σωτῆρες. In contrast to these, St. Paul emphasises the uniqueness of the σωτήρ and θεός worshipped by Christians. The contrast is exactly parallel to that in 1 Cor. viii. 6, εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοί, καὶ κύριοι πολλοί· ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ . . . καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησ. Χρ. The question as to the

Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, 6. ὁ [s]δοὺς [s]ἑαυτὸν [t]ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ [u]μαρτύριον [1] [v]καιροῖς [v]ἰδίοις, 7. [w]εἰς

s Gal. i. 4, Tit. ii. 14. t Here only not LXX. u Acts iv. 33, 1 Cor. i. 6, ii. 1, 2 Thess. i. 10, 2 Tim. i. 8. *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 8. v 1 Tim. vi. 15, Tit. i. 3. w 2 Tim. i. 11,

[1] Om. τὸ μαρτύριον A; καὶ μαρτ. ℵ*; οὗ τὸ μαρτ. καιρ. ἰδ. ἐδόθη D*FgrG, d, g, Ambrst., *datum est;* 67**, 80, 115 ins. οὗ. [Lucas Brug.: "*Testimonium temporibus suis.* His verbis nec praeponendum est *cuius*, nec postponendum *confirmatum est:* haec enim consulto a patribus omissa sunt". One at least of MSS. of vg. reads *confirmatum est.*]

mutual relations of the Persons of the Godhead had not arisen among Christians, and was not present to the writer's mind. Indeed if it had been we could not regard the epistle as a portion of revealed theology. Revealed theology is unconscious. The *prima facie* distinction here drawn between εἷς θεός and εἷς μεσίτης would have been impossible in a sub-apostolic orthodox writer.

Again, the oneness of God has a bearing on the practical question of man's salvation. It is possible for all men to be saved, because over them there are not many Gods that can exercise possibly conflicting will-power towards them, but one only. See also Rom. iii. 30. One Godhead stands over against one humanity; and the Infinite and the finite can enter into relations one with the other, since they are linked by a μεσίτης who is both God and man. It is noteworthy that μεσίτης θεοῦ κ. ἀνθρώπων is applied to the archangel Michael in *The Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Dan. vi. 2.

ἄνθρωπος explains how Christ Jesus could be a mediator. He can only be an adequate mediator whose sympathy with, and understanding of, both parties is cognisable by, and patent to, both. Now, although God's love for man is boundless, yet without the revelation of it by Christ it would not be certainly patent to man; not to add that one of two contending parties cannot be the mediator of the differences (Gal. iii. 20). See also Rom. v. 15. Again, we must note that ἄνθρωπος (*himself man*, R.V., not *the man*, A.V.) in this emphatic position suggests that the verity of our Lord's manhood was in danger of being ignored or forgotten.

Ver. 6. ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτόν: The Evangelists record our Lord's own declarations that His death was a spontaneous and voluntary sacrifice on His part, Matt. xx. 28 = Mark x. 45, δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. *Cf.* John x. 18; and St. Paul affirms it, Gal. i. 4, τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν; Tit. ii. 14, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. (παραδίδωμι is used in Gal. ii. 20, Eph. v. 2, 25). We may note that this statement necessarily implies not only the pre-existence of our Lord, but also His co-operation in the eternal counsels and purpose of the Father as regards the salvation of man.

Alford is probably right in saying that δοῦναι ἑαυτόν, as St. Paul expresses it, suggests more than δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. The latter might naturally be limited to the sacrifice of His death; the former connotes the sacrifice of His lifetime, the whole of the humiliation and self-emptying of the Incarnation. The soundness of this exegesis is not impaired by the probability that τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ may be nothing more than a Semitic periphrasis for ἑαυτόν. See J. H. Moulton, *Grammar*, vol. i. p. 87, who compares Mark viii. 36, ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, with Luke ix. 25, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς.

ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων: If we are to see any special force in the ἀντί, we may say that it expresses that the λύτρον is equivalent in value to the thing procured by means of it. But perhaps St. Paul's use of the word, if he did not coin it, is due to his desire to reaffirm our Lord's well-known declaration in the most emphatic way possible. λύτρον ἀντὶ merely implies an exchange; ἀντίλυτρον ὑπέρ implies that the exchange is decidedly a benefit to those on whose behalf it is made. As far as the suggestion of vicariousness is concerned, there does not seem to be much difference between the two phrases.

τὸ μαρτύριον, as Ellicott says, "is an accusative in apposition to the preceding sentence," or rather clause, ὁ δοὺς . . . πάντων. So R.V. Bengel compares ἔνδειγμα, 2 Thess. i. 5; *cf.* also Rom. xii. 1. The great act of self-sacrifice is timeless; but as historically apprehended by us, the testimony concerning it must be made during a particular and suitable

x 2 Tim. i. 11, 2 Pet. ii. 5. y John viii. 45, 46, Rom. ix. 1, *cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 6. z Rom. ix. 1, 2 Cor. xi. 31, Gal. i. 20. a 2 Tim. i. 11. b See 1 Tim. i. 2. c 2 Cor. i. 17, Phil. i. 12, 1 Tim. v. 14, Tit. iii. 8.

x ὃ w ἐτέθην ἐγὼ x κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος—y ἀλήθειαν y λέγω,[1] z οὐ z ψεύδομαι—a διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν b ἐν b πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. 8. c Βού-

[1] Add ἐν Χριστῷ (from Rom. ix. 1) ℵ*DcKL, 17, 37, many others, go., arm.

period of history, *i.e.*, from the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostolic company (Acts i. 8) until the Second Coming (2 Thess. i. 10). The temporal mission of the Son of God took place "when the fulness of the time came" (Gal. iv. 4); it was an **οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν** (Eph. i. 10). The testimony is of course borne by God (1 John v. 9-11), but He uses human agency, the preachers of the Gospel.

καιροῖς ἰδίοις: See reff. The analogy of Gal. vi. 9, **καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν,** suggests that we should render it always *in due season.* The plural expresses the fact that the bearing of testimony extends over many seasons; but each man reaps his own harvest only once. In any case, the seasons relate both to the Witness and that whereof He is a witness: "*his* own times" and "*its* own times" (R.V.).

The dative is that "of the time wherein the action takes place," Ell., who compares Rom. xvi. 25, **χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου.**

Ver. 7. **εἰς ὃ**: scil. **τὸ μαρτύριον,** or **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον,** as in the parallel passage, 2 Tim. i. 11.

The phrase **εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κῆρυξ κ. ἀπόστολος [καὶ] διδάσκαλος** is repeated in 2 Tim. i. 11, as **ἀλήθειαν . . . ψεύδομαι** occurs again Rom. ix. 1; but there we have the significant addition [**λέγω**] **ἐν Χριστῷ.** For similar asseverations of the writer's truthfulness see Rom. i. 9, 2 Cor. xi. 10, xii. 19, Gal. i. 20.

There is nothing derogatory from the apostle in supposing that the personal struggle in which he had been for years engaged with those who opposed his gospel made him always feel on the defensive, and that his self-vindication came to be expressed in stereotyped phrases which rose to his mind whenever the subject came before him, even in a letter to a loyal disciple.

κῆρυξ is used in the N.T. of a preacher here, and twice elsewhere; see reff. But **κήρυγμα** and **κηρύσσω** are constantly used of Christian preaching. *Cf.* esp. Rom. x. 15, **πῶς δὲ κηρύξωσιν ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσιν**; Bengel takes it in the sense of *ambassador; cf.* 2 Cor. v. 20.

διδάσκαλος: **διδάσκαλοι,** in the technical Christian sense, are mentioned in Acts xiii. 1, 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, Eph. iv. 11. Here and in 2 Tim. i. 11 the term is used in a general signification. St. Paul does use **διδάσκειν** of his own ministerial functions: 1 Cor. iv. 17, Col. i. 28, 2 Thess. ii. 15.

ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ: It is best to take both these words in connexion with **διδάσκαλος,** and objectively, *in the faith and the truth* (see on ch. i. 2). It is no objection to this view that the article is not expressed; the anarthrousness of common Christian terms is a feature of these epistles. Others, with Chrys., take both terms subjectively, *faithfully and truly.* Ellicott "refers **πίστις** to the subjective faith of the apostle, **ἀλήθ.** to the objective truth of the doctrine he delivered". This does not yield a natural sense.

Harnack notes that the collocation of **ἀπόστολος, διδάσκαλος** is peculiar to the Pastorals and Hermas (*Sim.* ix. 15, 16, 25; *Vis.* iii. 5, "The apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons"). Harnack opines that "Hermas passed over the prophets because he reckoned himself one of them". But the opinion of Lietzmann, which he quotes, seems sounder: Hermas "conceives this **προφητεύειν** as a private activity which God's equipment renders possible, but which lacks any official character" (*Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, trans. vol. i. p. 340).

Vv. 8—iii. 1*a*. The ministers of public prayer must be the men of the congregation, not the women. A woman's positive duty is to make herself conspicuous by good works, not by personal display. Her place in relation to man is one of subordination. This is one of the lessons of the inspired narratives of the Creation and of the Fall. Nevertheless this does not affect her eternal position. Salvation is the goal alike of man and woman. They both attain supreme blessedness in the working out of the primal penalty imposed on Adam and Eve.

Ver. 8. **βούλομαι οὖν**: **οὖν** is resumptive of the general topic of public worship

λομαι οὖν [d] προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας [e] ἐν [e] παντὶ [e] τόπῳ, [f] ἐπαίροντας [g] ὁσίους [f] χεῖρας [h] χωρὶς [i] ὀργῆς καὶ [k] διαλογισμοῦ,[1] 9. [1] ὡσαύτως [2 3] γυναῖκας ἐν [m] καταστολῇ [n] κοσμίῳ [4] μετὰ [o] αἰδοῦς καὶ [p] σωφροσύνης

d 1 Cor. xi. 4, 5, 13, xiv. 14, 15, e 1 Cor. i. 2. 2 Cor. ii. 14, 1 Thess. i. 8.

f Luke xxiv. 50. g Tit. i. 8, Heb. vii. 26, Rev. xv. 4, xvi. 5. h Phil. ii. 14, 1 Tim. v. 21. i Mark iii. 5, Rom. xii. 19, xiii. 4, 5, Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8, Jas. i. 19, 20. k Rom. xiv. 1, Phil. ii. 14. l 1 Tim. iii. 8, 11, v. 25, Tit. ii. 3, 6. m Here only N.T., Isa. lxi. 3. n Eccles. xii. 9, 1 Tim. iii. 2. o Here only N.T., 3 Macc. i. 19, iv. 5. p Acts xxvi. 25, ver. 15.

[1] So ℵ*ADKLP, d, f, m25, 81, r, vg., go., sah., arm.; διαλογισμῶν ℵcFgrG, 17, 47, 67**, 80, nineteen others, g, boh., syrr.

[2] Ins. καὶ ℵcDFGKL, d, f, g, m81, r (*autem et*), vg., go., sah., boh., syrr., arm.; om καὶ ℵ*AP, 17, 71.

[3] Ins. τὰς DbcKL. [4] κοσμίως ℵcDgr*FG, 17.

from which the writer has digressed in vv. 3-7. **βούλομαι οὖν** is found again in v. 14. In both places, **βούλομαι** has the force of a practical direction issued after deliberation. See also reff. On the contrary, **θέλω δέ** is used only in reference to abstract subjects. See Rom. xvi. 19, 1 Cor. vii. 7, 32, xi. 3, xiv. 5. **προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας**: *that the men should conduct public worship.* Perhaps Bengel is right in understanding 1 Peter iii. 7 in the same sense. See reff. for **προσεύχεσθαι** in this special signification. **τοὺς ἄνδρας**: *the men* of the community as opposed to the women, ver. 9 (R.V.). There is no specific restriction of the conduct of worship to a clergy.

ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ: to be connected with what precedes: the directions are to apply to every Church without exception; no allowance is to be made for conditions peculiar to any locality; as it is expressed in 1 Cor. xiv. 33, 34, **ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἁγίων, αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν.** The words do not mean *in any place*, as though fixed places for worship were a matter of indifference; neither is there any allusion, as Chrys. explain it, to the abolition by Christ of the restriction of worship to one place, Jerusalem, as in John iv. 21. **ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας**: This is not directly intended to enjoin a particular gesture appropriate to prayer, but merely avoids the repetition of **προσεύχεσθαι.** To uplift the hands in prayer was customary: 1 Kings viii. 22, Ps. xxviii., 2 etc., Isa. i. 15, Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 29. The men that are to have the conduct of the public worship of the Church must be upright men who have clean hands, hands that are holy (Job. xvii. 9; Ps. xxiii. (xxiv.) 4; Jas. iv. 8). For **ὅσιος** as an adj. of *two* terminations, compare Luke ii. 13, Rev. iv. 3. See Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 80.

χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ: This indicates the two conditions necessary to effectual prayer: *freedom from irritation* towards our fellow-men (Matt. vi. 14, 15, Mark xi. 25), and confidence towards God (Jas. i. 6; Luke xii. 29). **διαλογισμός** has the sense of *doubt* in Rom. xiv. 1. This sense (A.V. *doubting*) is that given to the term here by Chrysostom (**ἀμφιβολία**) and Theodoret (**πιστεύων ὅτι λήψῃ**). The rendering *disputing* (R.V.) *disceptatio* (Vulg.) merely enlarges the notion conveyed in **ὀργή.** The reff. to **ὀργή** are places where it is spoken of as a human affection.

Ver. 9. Having assigned to the men the prominent duties of the Church, St. Paul proceeds to render impossible any misconception of his views on this subject by forbidding women to teach in public. But he begins by emphasising what is their characteristic and proper glory, the beauty of personality which results from active beneficence.

The essential parts of the sentence are **ὡσαύτως γυναῖκας . . . κοσμεῖν ἑαυτὰς . . . δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.** Both **προσεύχεσθαι** and **κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς** depend on **βούλομαι,** as does **ὡσαύτως,** which introduces another regulation laid down by the apostle. In the Christian Society, it was St. Paul's deliberate wish that the men should conduct public worship, and that the women should adorn the Society and themselves by good works. This verse has no reference to the demeanour of women while in Church. It is inconsistent with the whole context to supply **προσεύχεσθαι** after **γυναῖκας.**

The connexion of **ἐν καταστολῇ—σωφροσύνης** has been disputed. Ellicott takes it as "a kind of adjectival predication to be appended to **γυναῖκας,**" stating what is the normal condition of women, who are to superadd the adornment of good works. But it is more natural to

q Tit. ii. 10, 1 Pet. iii. 5. r Here only, not LXX s 1 Pet. iii. 3, Rev. xvii. 4. t Luke vii. 25, ix. 29, John xix. 24, Acts xx. 33. u Mark xiv. 3, 1 Pet. iii. 4. v Eph. v. 3, Tit. ii. 1, Heb. ii. 10, vii. 26. w 1 Tim. vi. 21, Tit. i. 2. x Here only N.T., *cf.* John ix. 31. y 1 Tim. v. 10, 2 Tim. ii. 21, iii. 17, Tit. i. 16, iii. 1. z Acts xxii. 2, 2 Thess. iii. 12. a 1 Cor. xiv. 35. b Wisd. xviii. 16, 2 Cor. ix. 13, Gal. ii. 5, 1 Tim. iii. 4.

q κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, μὴ ἐν r πλέγμασιν καὶ[1] s χρυσίῳ[2] ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ t ἱματισμῷ u πολυτελεῖ, 10. ἀλλ'—ὃ v πρέπει γυναιξὶν w ἐπαγγελλο-
r μέναις x θεοσέβειαν—δι' y ἔργων y ἀγαθῶν. 11. Γυνὴ ἐν z ἡσυχίᾳ
s a μανθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ b ὑποταγῇ. 12. διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ[3] οὐκ

[1] ἢ DcKL, f, m81, r, vg., go., sah., syrhcl.

[2] So AFGP, 17, 31, 47, 80, a few others; χρυσῷ ℵDKL.

[3] γυν. δὲ διδάσκ. KL.

connect it directly with **κοσμεῖν**, with which **ἐν πλέγμασιν, κ.τ.λ.** is also connected as well as **δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν**; the change of preposition being due to the distinction between the means employed for adornment and the resultant expression of it. The effect of the practice of good works is seen in an *orderly appearance*, etc.

ὡσαύτως is a word of frequent occurrence in the Pastorals. See reff. Except in v. 25, it is used as a connecting link between items in a series of regulations. The use of it in Rom. viii. 26, 1 Cor. xi. 25 is different.

καταστολή, as Ellicott says, "conveys the idea of external appearance as *principally* exhibited in dress". It is "*deportment*, as exhibited externally, whether in look, manner or dress". The commentators cite in illustration Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 4, where the **καταστολὴ κ. σχῆμα σώματος** of the Essenes is described in detail. The Latin *habitus* is a good rendering, if we do not restrict that term to dress, as the Vulg. here, *habitu ornato*, seems to do. But *ordinato* (r) hits the meaning better.

κόσμιος is applied to the episcopus in iii. 2. It means *orderly*, as opposed to disorderliness in appearance. **κοσμίως** (see *apparat. crit.*) would be a **ἅπαξ λεγ.** both in Old and New Testament. **μετὰ αἰδοῦς**: *with shamefastness and self-control* or *discreetness*: the inward characteristic, and the external indication or evidence of it.

For **σωφροσύνη**, see Trench, *Synonyms, N.T.* The cognate words **σωφρονίζειν**, Tit. ii. 4; **σωφρονισμός**, 2 Tim. i. 7; **σωφρόνως**, Tit. ii. 12; **σώφρων**, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 8, ii. 2, 5, are in N.T. peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles; but **σωφρονεῖν**, Tit. ii. 6, is found also in Mark, Luke, Rom., 2 Cor. and 1 Pet. See Dean Bernard's note here.

ἐν πλέγμασιν, κ.τ.λ.: The parallel in 1 Pet. iii. 3, **ὁ ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων, ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος**, is only a parallel. The two passages are quite independent. The vanities of dress—of men and women—is common topic.

Ver. 10. **ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει**: It has been assumed above that **δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν** is to be connected with **κοσμεῖν.** In this case **ὃ πρέπει—θεοσέβειαν** is a parenthetical clause in apposition to the sentence. It is, however, possible, though not so natural, to connect **δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν** with **ἐπαγγ. θεοσ.** So Vulg., *promittentes pietatem per bona opera.* Then **ὃ** would mean **καθ' ὅ**, or **ἐν τούτῳ ὅ** (Math.), and the whole clause, **ἀλλ' ὃ—ἀγαθῶν**, would be an awkward periphrasis for, and repetition of, **ἐν καταστολῇ—σωφροσύνης.**

ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι usually means *to promise* as in Tit. i. 2; but here and in vi. 21 *to profess.*

θεοσέβεια: **ἅπ. λεγ.**, but the adj. **θεοσεβής** occurs John ix. 31.

διά is instrumental, as in iv. 5, 2 Tim. i. 6, 10, 14, iii. 15, iv. 17, Tit. iii. 5, 6, not of accompanying circumstances, as in 1 Tim. ii. 15, iv. 14, 2 Tim. ii. 2.

ἔργων ἀγαθῶν: see note on chap. iii. 1.

Ver. 11 *sqq.* With these directions compare those in 1 Cor. xiv. 33-35.

ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ: *with complete subjection* [to their husbands]. *Cf.* Tit. ii. 5.

Ver. 12. **διδάσκειν**: This refers of course only to public teaching, or to a wife's teaching her husband. In Tit. ii. 3 St. Paul indicates the natural sphere for woman's teaching. In 1 Cor. women are forbidden **λαλεῖν** in the Church. The choice of terms is appropriate in each case.

αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός: *dominari in virum, to have dominion over* (R.V.). "The adj. **αὐθεντικός** is very well established in the vernacular. See Nägeli, p. 49

ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ [c]αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν [g]ἡσυχίᾳ. 13. [c] Here only, not LXX.
Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος [d]ἐπλάσθη, εἶτα Εὔα· 14. καὶ Ἀδὰμ οὐκ [d] Gen. ii. 7, Rom. ix. 20.
[e]ἠπατήθη, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ [f]ἐξαπατηθεῖσα [1] ἐν [g]παραβάσει γέγονεν. 15. [e] Eph. v. 6, Jas. i. 26.

[f] Rom. vii. 11, xvi. 18, 1 Cor. iii. 18, 2 Cor. xi. 3, 2 Thess. ii. 3. [g] Rom. ii. 23, iv. 15, v. 14, Gal. iii. 19, Heb. ii. 2, ix. 15.

[1] ἀπατηθεῖσα ℵcDb? cKL.

. . . the Atticist warns his pupil to use **αὐτοδικεῖν** because **αὐθεντεῖν** was vulgar (**κοινότερον**) . . . **αὐθέντης** is properly one who acts on his own authority, hence in this context an autocrat" (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 374)

ἀλλ' εἶναι: dependent on some such verb as **βούλομαι** implied, as opposed to **οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω.**

Ver. 13. It would not be fair to say that St. Paul's judgment about the relative functions of men and women in the church depended on his belief as to the historicity of the Biblical story of the Creation. He certainly uses this account in support of his conclusions; yet supposing the literal truth of the early chapters of Genesis, it would be possible to draw quite other inferences from it. The first specimen produced of a series is not always the most perfect. The point in which Adam's superiority over Eve comes out in the narrative of the Fall is his greater strength of intellect; therefore men are better fitted for the work of public instruction. "The woman taught once, and ruined all" (Chrys.). Eve's reasoning faculty was at once overcome by the allegation of jealousy felt by God, an allegation plausible to a nature swayed by emotion rather than by reflection. The Tempter's statement seemed to be supported by the appearance of the fruit, as it was rendered attractive by hopes of vanity to be gratified. Adam's better judgment was overcome by personal influence (Gen. iii. 17, "Thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife"); he was not deceived. But the intellectual superior who sins against light may be morally inferior to him who stumbles in the dusk.

Ἀδὰμ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη: The elder should rule. A more profound statement of this fact is found in 1 Cor. xi 9, **οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα, ἀλλὰ γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα.**

πλάσσειν is the term used in Gen. ii. 7 and expresses the notion of God as a potter, Rom. ix. 20. (*am* here has *figuratus*.)

Ver. 14. **ἡ δὲ γυνή**: St. Paul says **ἡ γυνή** rather than **Εὔα**, emphasing the sex rather than the individual, because he desires to gives the incident its general application, especially in view of what follows. So Chrys.

ἐξαπατηθεῖσα: It is doubtful if we are entitled to render this, as Ell. does, *being completely deceived*. In 2 Cor. xi. 3 St. Paul says **ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὔαν**, where there is no reason why he should not have used the simple verb. St. Paul uses the compound verb in five other places, the simple verb only once (see reff.). So that the simplest account that we can give of his variation here, and in 2 Cor. xi. 3, from the **ὁ ὄφις ἠπάτησέν με** of Gen. iii. 13, is that the compound verb came naturally to his mind.

ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν: Inasmuch as **παράβασις** is used of Adam's transgression in Rom. v. 14, it may be asked, What is the force of St. Paul's apparent restriction here of the phrase to Eve? Might it not be said of Adam as well, that he **ἐν παραβ. γέγονεν**? To which St. Paul would perhaps have replied that he meant that it was woman who *first* transgressed, in consequence of having been deceived. **ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀρχὴ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ἀποθνήσκομεν πάντες.** Ecclus. xxv. 24. This notion of *coming into a state of sin at a definite point of time* is well expressed by **γέγονεν.** For **γίνεσθαι ἐν** *cf.* **ἡ διακονία . . . ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ** (2 Cor. iii. 7); **ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας ἐγενήθημεν** (1 Thess. ii. 5).

Ver. 15. **σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας**: The penalty for transgression, so far as woman is concerned, was expressed in the words, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children" (Gen. iii. 16). But just as in the case of man, the world being as it is, the sentence has proved a blessing, so it is in the case of woman. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" expresses man's necessity, duty, privilege, dignity. If the necessity of work be "a stumbling-block," man can "make it a stepping-stone" (Browning, *The Ring and the*

h Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 14.
i John viii. 31, xv. 9, 10, 2 Tim. iii. 14, 1 John iv. 16, 2 John 9.
k See 1 Tim. i. 14.
l Rom. vi. 19, 22, 1 Cor. i. 30, 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7, 2 Thess. ii. 13, Heb. xii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 2.
m Ver. 9.
a See 1 Tim i. 15.

h σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς h τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν i μείνωσιν i ἐν k πίστει k καὶ k ἀγάπῃ καὶ l ἁγιασμῷ μετὰ m σωφροσύνης· III. 1. a Πιστὸς l ὁ a λόγος.

l ἀνθρώπινος D*, *humanus* d, m47, g (*humanus t fidelis*), Ambrst., Sedul. Similarly *humanus* is the rendering in chap. i. 15 in r, Aug., Julianpelag apud Aug. Jerome comments adversely on this rendering (Ep. 24 ad Marcell.).

Book, The Pope, 413), Nay, it is the only stepping-stone available to him. If St. Paul's argument had led him to emphasise the man's part in the first transgression, he might have said, "He shall be saved in his toil," his overcoming the obstacles of nature.

So St. Paul, taking the common-sense view that childbearing, rather than public teaching or the direction of affairs, is woman's primary function, duty, privilege and dignity, reminds Timothy and his readers that there was another aspect of the story in Genesis besides that of woman's taking the initiative in transgression: the pains of childbirth were her sentence, yet in undergoing these she finds her salvation. *She shall be saved in her childbearing* (R.V.m. nearly). That is her normal and natural duty; and in the discharge of our normal and natural duties we all, men and women alike, as far as our individual efforts can contribute to it, "work out our own salvation".

This explanation gives an adequate force to **σωθήσεται**, and preserves the natural and obvious meaning of **τεκνογονία**, and gives its force to **τῆς**. **διά** here has hardly an instrumental force (as Vulg. *per filiorum generationem*); it is rather the **διά** of accompanying circumstances, as in 1 Cor. iii. 15. **σωθήσεται . . . διὰ πυρός.** It remains to note three other explanations:—

(1) She shall be "preserved in the great danger of child-birth".

(2) Women shall be saved if they bring up their children well, as if **τεκνογονία** = **τεκνοτροφία**. So Chrys.

(3) She shall be saved by means of *the Childbearing* "of Mary, which gave to the world the Author of our Salvation" (Liddon). "The peculiar function of her sex (from its relation to her Saviour) shall be the medium of her salvation" (Ellicott). The R.V., *saved through the childbearing*, is possibly patient of this interpretation. No doubt it was the privilege of woman alone to be the medium of the Incarnation. This miraculous fact justifies us perhaps in pressing the language of Gen. iii. 15, "thy seed," and in finding an allusion (though this is uncertain) in Gal. iv. 4, **γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός**; but woman cannot be said to be saved by means of a historic privilege, even with the added qualification, "if they continue," etc. See Luke xi. 27, 28, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee. . . . Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God," etc.

ἐὰν μείνωσιν: This use of **μένειν** with **ἐν** and an abstract noun is chiefly Johannine, as the reff. show.

The subject of **μείνωσιν** is usually taken to be **γυναῖκες**; but inasmuch as St. Paul has been speaking of women in the marriage relation, it seems better to understand the plural of the woman and her husband. Compare 1 Cor. vii. 36 where **γαμείτωσαν** refers to the **παρθένος** and her betrothed, whose existence is implied in the question of her marriage. If this view be accepted, then **πίστις, ἀγάπη,** and **ἁγιασμός** refer respectively to the duties of the man and wife to God, to society, and to each other: faith towards God, love to the community, and sanctification in their marital relations. See chap. iv. 12 where these three virtues are again combined. See ver. 9 for **σωφροσύνη**.

CHAPTER III.—Ver. 1. **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος**: This refers to the exegesis of Genesis which has preceded. (So Chrys.). We may compare Barnabas, § 9, where, after an allegorical explanation of Abraham's 318 servants, the writer exclaims, **οὐδεὶς γνησιώτερον ἔμαθεν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ λόγον· ἀλλὰ οἶδα ὅτι ἄξιοί ἐστε ὑμεῖς.** See note on i. 15.

Vv. 1 *b*-13. The qualifications of the men who are to be ministers; and first (*a*) of the episcopus (1 *b*-7) secondly (*b*) of the deacons (8-13) with a parenthetical instruction respecting women church-workers (11).

Εἴ τις [b]ἐπισκοπῆς [c]ὀρέγεται, [d]καλοῦ [d]ἔργου [e]ἐπιθυμεῖ. 2. [f]δεῖ [f]οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον [g]ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, [h]μιᾶς [h]γυναικὸς [h]ἄνδρα, [i]νηφά-

b Here only in this sense, *cf.* Acts i. 20. c 1 Tim. vi. 10, Heb. xi. 16. d 1 Tim. v. 10, 25, vi. 18, Tit. ii. 7, 14, iii. 8, 14. e Here only in Pastorals. f Acts i. 21. g 1 Tim. v. 7, vi. 14, not LXX. h Ver. 12, Tit. i. 6. i 1 Tim. iii. 11, Tit. ii. 2, not LXX.

εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς, κ.τ.λ.: Having given elementary directions concerning the scope of public prayer, and the ministers thereof, St. Paul now takes up the matter of Church organisation. He begins with the office of the episcopus, or presbyter, because that is of the very essence of Church order. On the question as to the terms presbyter and episcopus, it is sufficient here to state my own conclusion, that they represent slightly different aspects of the same office, pastoral and official; aspects which came naturally into prominence in the Jewish and Greek societies respectively which gave birth to the names. This seems the obvious conclusion from a comparison of Acts xx. 17, 28; Phil. i. 1; Tit. i. 5, 7; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 4, 5, v. 17; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2; Clem. Rom. 1 *Cor.* 44; Polycarp, 5; Clem. Al. *Quis Dives*, § 42.

ὀρέγεται . . . ἐπιθυμεῖ: The R.V. (*seeketh . . . desireth*) indicates to the English reader that two distinct Greek words are used; a fact which is concealed in the A.V. (*desire . . . desireth*). So Vulg. has *desiderat* in both places; but m[47], *cupit . . . desiderat.* **ὀρέγεσθαι,** which occurs again in vi. 10 of *reaching after* money, is not used in any depreciatory sense. Field (in loc.) notes that "it has a special application to such objects as a man is commonly said to *aspire to*". The sanity of St. Paul's judgment is nowhere better seen than in his commendation of lawful ambition. A man may be actuated by a variety of motives; yet it is not inevitable that those that are lower should impair the quality of the higher; they need not interpenetrate each other. In any case, St. Paul credits the aspirant with the noblest ideal: *He who aspires to be an episcopus desires to perform a good work*, "*Est opus; negotium, non otium.* Acts xv. 38, Phil. ii. 30" (Bengel).

καλοῦ ἔργου: **καλὸν ἔργον** and **καλὰ ἔργα** (see reff.) are not peculiar to the Pastorals (Matt. v. 16, xxvi. 10 = Mark xiv. 6; John x. 32, 33); but, as the references show, the phrase is found in them only of the Pauline Epistles. On the other hand, **ἔργα ἀγαθά** occurs six times in the Pastorals. See reff. on chap. ii. 10. We perceive in the use of it a qualification of the earlier depreciation of the works of the Law, induced by a natural reaction from the abuse of that teaching.

Ver. 2. With the qualifications of the episcopus as given here should be compared those of the deacons, ver. 8 *sqq.*, and those of the episcopus in Tit. i. 6 *sqq.*

δεῖ οὖν . . . ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι. The **ἐπισκοπή** being essentially a good work, "*bonum negotium bonis committendum*" (Bengel). The episcopus is the *persona* of the Church. It is not enough for him to be not criminal; he must be *one against whom it is impossible to bring any charge of wrong doing such as could stand impartial examination.* (See Theodoret, cited by Alf.). He must be *without reproach* (R.V.), *irreprehensible* (Trench), a term which involves a less exacting test than *blameless* (A.V.); the deacon (and the Cretan episcopus) must be **ἀνέγκλητος,** *one against whom no charge has, in point of fact, been brought.*

No argument can be based on the singular **τὸν ἐπίσκοπον,** here or in Tit. i. 7, in favour either of the monarchical episcopate or as indications of the late date of the epistle; it is used generically as **ἡ χήρα,** ch. v. 5; **δοῦλον Κυρίου,** 2 Tim. ii. 24.

The better to ensure that the episcopus be *without reproach*, his leading characteristic must be self-control. In the first place—and this has special force in the East—he must be a man who has—natural or acquired—a high conception of the relations of the sexes: a married man, who, if his wife dies, does not marry again. Men whose position is less open to criticism may do this without discredit, but the episcopus must hold up a high ideal. Second marriage, which is mentioned as a familiar practice (Rom. vii. 2, 3), is expressly permitted to Christian women in 1 Cor. vii. 39, and even recommended to, or rather enjoined upon, young widows in 1 Tim. v. 14.

μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, of course, does not mean that the episcopus must be, or have been, married. What is here forbidden is digamy under any circumstances. This view is supported (*a*) by the general drift of the qualities required here in a bishop; self-control or temperance, in his use of food and drink, pos-

[k] Tit. i. 8, ii. 2, 5. [l] See 1 Tim. ii. 9. [m] Tit. i. 8, 1 λιον, [k]σώφρονα, [l]κόσμιον, [m]φιλόξενον, [n]διδακτικόν, 3. μὴ [o]πάροινον, [o]πλήκτην,[l] ἀλλὰ [p]ἐπιεικῆ, [q]ἄμαχον, [r]ἀφιλάργυρον, 4. τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου [s]καλῶς [t]προϊστάμενον, τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν [u]ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης

Pet. iv. 9, not LXX, *cf.* Rom. xii. 13, Heb. xiii. 2. [n] 2 Tim. ii. 24, not LXX. [o] Tit. i. 7, not LXX. [p] Phil. iv. 5, Tit. iii, 2, Jas. iii. 17, 1 Pet. ii. 18. [q] Tit. iii. 2, not LXX. [r] Heb. xiii. 5, not LXX. [s] Ver. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17. [t] Rom. xii. 8, 1 Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. iii. 12, v. 17, *cf.* Tit. iii. 8, 14. [u] See 1 Tim. ii. 11.

[l] Ins. μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ 37, very many others.

sessions, gifts, temper; (*b*) by the corresponding requirement in a church widow, v. 9, **ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή**, and (*c*) by the practice of the early church (Apostolic Constitutions, vi. 17; Apostolic Canons, 16 (17); Tertullian, *ad Uxorem*, i. 7: *de Monogam.* 12; *de Exhort. Castitatis*, cc. 7, 13; Athenagoras, *Legat.* 33; Origen, *in Lucam*, xvii. p. 953, and the Canons of the councils, *e.g.*, Neocaesarea (A.D. 314) can. 7. Quinisext. can. 3).

On the other hand, it must be conceded that the patristic commentators on the passage (with the partial exception of Chrysostom)—Theodore Mops. Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome—suppose that it is bigamy or polygamy that is here forbidden. But commentators are prone to go too far in the emancipation of their judgments from the prejudices or convictions of their contemporaries. In some matters "the common sense of most" is a safer guide than the irresponsible conjectures of a conscientious student.

νηφάλιον: *temperate* (R.V.). A.V. has *vigilant* here, following Chrys.; *sober* in ver. 11, and Tit. ii. 2, with *vigilant* in margin. As this quality is required also in women officials, ver. 11, and in aged men, Tit. ii. 2, it has in all probability a reference to moderate use of wine, etc., and so would be equivalent to the **μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντας** of the diaconal qualifications, ver. 8. **ἐγκρατῆ** is the corresponding term in Tit. i. 8. The adj. only occurs in these three places; but the verb **νήφειν** six times; in 1 Thess. v. 6, 8, and in 1 Peter iv. 7, it is used of the moderate use of strong drink.

σώφρονα: *soberminded* (R.V.), *serious*, *earnest*. See note on ii. 9. Vulg., *prudentem* here and in Tit. ii. 2, 5; but *sobrium* in Tit. i. 8. Perhaps **σεμνός** (ver. 8) is the quality in deacons that corresponds to **σώφρων** and **κόσμιος** in the episcopus.

κόσμιον: *orderly* (R.V.), perhaps *dignified* in the best sense of the term. *ordinatum* (m[47]). "Quod **σώφρων** est intus, id **κόσμιος** est extra" (Bengel). The word is not found in *Titus*.

φιλόξενον: This virtue is required in the episcopus also in Tit. i. 8, but not of the deacons, below; of Christians generally, 1 Peter iv. 9, 1 Tim. v. 10 (*q.v.*), Rom. xii. 13, Heb. vi. 10, xiii. 2, 3 John 5. See Hermas, *Sim.* ix. 27 ("Bishops, hospitable persons (**φιλόξενοι**), who gladly received into their houses at all times the servants of God without hypocrisy"). This duty, in episcopi, "was closely connected with the maintenance of external relations," which was their special function. See Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 368.

διδακτικόν, as a moral quality would involve not merely the ability, but also the willingness, to teach, such as ought to characterise a servant of the Lord, 2 Tim. ii. 24. The notion is expanded in Tit. i. 9. The deacon's relation to theology is passive, ver. 9.

Ver. 3. **μὴ πάροινον** (*no brawler*, R.V., *quarrelsome over wine*, R.V.m.), and **μὴ πλήκτην** are similarly coupled together in Tit. i. 7. **παροινία** means *violent temper*, not specially excited by over-indulgence in strong drink. In the time of Chrysostom and Theodoret manners had so far softened that it was felt necessary to explain the term **πλήκτης** figuratively, of "some who unseasonably smite the consciences of their brethren". But see 2 Cor. xi. 20.

ἀλλ' ἐπιεικῆ, ἄμαχον: *gentle, not contentious*. This pair, again, of cognate adjectives is repeated in the general directions as to Christian conduct, Tit. iii. 2. Compare 2 Tim. ii. 24 (of the servant of the Lord). The corresponding episcopal virtues in *Titus* (i. 7) are **μὴ αὐθάδη, μὴ ὀργίλον**.

ἀφιλάργυρον: In *Titus* the corresponding episcopal virtue is **μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ**. See note on ver. 8 and Tit. i. 7.

Ver. 4. **τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου**: Although **ἴδιος** commonly retains in the N.T. the emphatic sense *own*, yet there can be no doubt that examples occur of the later weakened sense in which it means simply **αὐτοῦ**, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. vii. 2. We are not therefore justified in insisting on the emphatic sense, *own*, here or in ver. 12,

[v] σεμνότητος,—5. εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου [t] προστῆναι οὐκ οἶδεν, πῶς [v] See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
[w] ἐκκλησίας [w] Θεοῦ [x] ἐπιμελήσεται;—6. μὴ [y] νεόφυτον, ἵνα μὴ [z] τυφω- [w] Ver. 15, see note here.

[x] Luke x. 34, 35. [y] Here only, N.T. [z] 1 Tim. vi. 4, 2 Tim. iii. 4, not LXX.

vi. 1, Tit. ii. 5, 9. See J. H. Moulton *Grammar*, vol. i. p. 87 *sqq.*, and *Expositor*, vi., iii. 277, and Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 123 *sq.* **οἶκος** also means *household*, 1 Cor. i. 16 and in the Pastorals.

προϊστάμενον: **προΐστασθαι** is perhaps used, here and in ver. 12, because it would naturally suggest church government. See reff., and Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 65. A different use is found in Tit. iii. 8, 14, **καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι**, where see note. The domestic qualification, as we may call it, of the episcopus, also applies to deacons (ver. 12) and to the Cretan episcopus (Tit. i. 6).

τέκνα ἔχοντα: Alford cannot be right in supposing that **τέκνα** is emphatic. It would be absurd to suppose that a man otherwise suited to the office of an episcopus would be disqualified because of childlessness. The clause is parallel to **μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα**: if the episcopus be a married man, he must not be a digamist; if he have children, they must be **ἐν ὑποταγῇ**.

ἐν ὑποταγῇ—σεμνότητος: *with the strictest regard to propriety*, see note on chap. ii. 2. Most commentators join these words closely together. The **σεμνότης** of the children in their extra-family relations being the outward and visible expression of the **ὑποταγή** to which they are subject in domestic life. This is a more natural reference of **σεμνότ.** than to the general household arrangements, "*ut absit luxuria*" (Bengel). On the other hand, there is much force in Dean Bernard's remark that "**σεμνότης** is hardly a grace of childhood." He connects **ἔχοντα μετὰ πασ. σεμν.** This seems to be supported by ver. 8, **διακόνους ὡσαύτως σεμνούς** and ver. 11. Von Soden takes a similar view.

Ver. 5. The argument is akin to that stated by our Lord, Luke xvi. 10. "He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much, etc." It is all the more cogent inasmuch as the Church is the house of God. The point is resumed in ver. 15. Alf. quotes a sentence from Plato in which both **προστῆναι** and **ἐπιμελεῖσθαι** are used of the government of a family; nevertheless it is not fanciful to suppose that we have here a deliberate interchange of terms, **προστῆναι** being, as we have seen above, almost a technical term to express Church government; while **ἐπιμελ.** expresses the personal care and attention of a father for his family. See the use of the verb in Luke x. 34, 35, and of **ἐπιμέλεια** in Acts xxvii. 3.

ἐκκλησία θεοῦ is also found in ver. 15. **ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ** occurs nine times in Paul (1 Thess.; 2 Thess.; 1 Cor.; 2 Cor.; Gal.). The omission of the article before **θεοῦ** is characteristic of the Pastorals. The phrase is found also in St. Paul's apostolic charge to the episcopi of Ephesus in Acts xx. 28.

Ver. 6. Verses 6 and 7 have nothing corresponding to them in *Titus*, or in the qualifications for the diaconate in this chapter.

μὴ νεόφυτον κ.τ.λ.: *not a recent convert.* **νεόφυτος** in O.T. is used literally of a young plant (Job xiv. 9; Ps. cxxvii. (cxxviii.) 3; cxliii. (cxliv.) 12; Isa. v. 7). For its use in secular literature, see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 220.

The significance of this qualification is apparent from its absence in the parallel passage in *Titus*. It is evident that Church organisation in Crete was in a very much less advanced state than in Ephesus. On the first introduction of the Gospel into a country, the apostles naturally "appointed their first fruits to be bishops and deacons" (Clem. Rom. i. § 42; Acts xiv. 23), because no others were available; and men appointed in such circumstances would have no temptation to be puffed up any more than would the leaders of a forlorn hope. But as soon as there came to be a Christian community of such a size as to supply a considerable number of men from whom leaders could be selected, and in which office might be a natural object of ambition, the moral risk to **νεόφυτοι** of early advancement would be a real danger. It is difficult to avoid at least a passing attack of **τύφωσις**, if you are promoted when young.

τυφωθείς: **τυφόω** comes from **τῦφος**, the primary meaning of which is *smoke* or *vapour*, then *conceit* or *vanity* which befogs a man's judgment in matters in which he himself is concerned. The R.V. always renders it *puffed up*. Vulg. here, *in superbiam elatus*.

a 1 Tim. vi 9, Heb. x. 31. b Eph. iv. 27, vi. 11, 1 Tim. iii. 7, 2 Tim. ii. 26. c Tit. i. 13 only, in Paul. d Mark iv. 11, 1 Cor. v. 12, 13, Col. iv. 5, 1 Thess. iv. 12. e Rom. xv. 3 (Ps. lxix 10), Heb. x. 33, xi. 26, xiii. 13. f Rom. xi. 9 (Ps. lxix. 23), 1 Tim. vi. 9. g 2 Tim. ii. 26. h See 1 Tim. ii. 9. i Phil. iv. 8, 1 Tim. iii. 11, Tit. ii. 2.

θεὶς εἰς κρίμα [a] ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ [b] διαβόλου. 7. δεῖ δὲ [1] καὶ [c] μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ [d] τῶν [d] ἔξωθεν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς [e] ὀνειδισμὸν [a] ἐμπέσῃ καὶ [f g] παγίδα [g] τοῦ [b g] διαβόλου. 8. Διακόνους [h] ὡσαύτως [i] σεμνούς,[2]

[1] Ins. αὐτὸν DKLP, d, f, m47, vg. [2] Om. σεμνούς א*, three cursives.

κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου: **κρίμα** is best taken in the sig. *condemnation*, as in Rom. iii. 8, Rev. xvii. 1, and **τοῦ διαβόλου** as objective genitive: "*Lest he be involved in the condemnation which the devil incurred*," or, *the judgment pronounced on the devil*, whose sin was, and is, pride. See Ecclus. x. 13, 2 Pet. ii. 4. So most commentators, especially the ancients. On the other hand, **τοῦ διαβόλου** in ver. 7 is the subjective genitive, *a snare laid by the devil;* and it is possible to render **κρίμα τ. διαβ.** *the accusation brought by the devil*, or *a judgment effected by the devil*, who may succeed in this case, though he failed in that of Job. This is however not a natural translation; and it is to be observed that **ἐμπίπτειν** in reff. expresses a final doom, not a trial, such as that of temptation or probation. Dean Bernard takes **τοῦ διαβόλου** as subjective genitive in both verses; and in the sense of *slanderer: the judgment passed by the slanderer; the snare prepared by the slanderer.*

τοῦ διαβόλου: St. Paul uses this name for the Evil Spirit three times in the Pastorals and twice in Eph. (see reff.); **ὁ πονηρός** in Eph. vi. 16; **ὁ Σατανᾶς** elsewhere eight times. **διάβολος**, without the article, means *slanderer* in ver. 11 and reff. there.

Ver. 7. **τῶν ἔξωθεν**: **οἱ ἔξω** in Mark iv. 11 (**ἔξωθεν**, W.H. m.) means those who came into contact—more or less close—with Jesus, but who were not His disciples. In the Pauline use (see reff.) it means the non-Christian Society in which the Church lives. St. Paul's attitude towards *them that are without* is one of the many proofs of his sanity of judgment. On the one hand, they are emphatically outside the Church; they have no *locus standi* in it, no right to interfere. On the other hand, they have the law of God written in their hearts; and, up to a certain point, their moral instincts are sound and their moral judgments worthy of respect. In the passage before us, indeed, St. Paul may be understood to imply that the opinion of "those without" might usefully balance or correct that of the Church. There is something blameworthy in a man's character if the consensus of outside opinion be unfavourable to him; no matter how much he may be admired and respected by his own party. The *vox populi*, then, is in some sort a *vox Dei;* and one cannot safely assume, when we are in antagonism to it, that, because we are Christians, we are absolutely in the right and the world wholly in the wrong. Thus to defy public opinion in a superior spirit may not only bring *discredit*, **ὀνειδισμός**, on oneself and on the Church, but also catch us in the devil's snare, *viz.*, a supposition that because the world condemns a certain course of action, the action is therefore right and the world's verdict may be safely set aside.

We cannot infer with Alford and von Soden, from the absence of another preposition before **παγίδα**, that **ὀνειδισμόν** also depends on **τοῦ διαβόλου**. It would not be easy to explain satisfactorily **ὀνειδ. τ. διαβόλου.**

Ver. 8. **διακόνους ὡσαύτως**: *s.c.* **δεῖ εἶναι.**

For **ὡσαύτως**, see on ii. 9.

σεμνούς: *grave.* "The word we want is one in which the sense of gravity and dignity, and of these as inviting reverence, is combined" (Trench). See note on ver. 2. The term is used in reference to women workers and old men.

μὴ διλόγους: Persons who are in an intermediate position, having in the same department chiefs and subordinates, are exposed to a temptation to speak of the same matter in different tones and manner, according as their interlocutor is above or below them. So Theodoret, **ἕτερα μὲν τούτῳ ἕτερα δὲ ἐκείνῳ λέγοντες.** Polycarp (§ 5) has the same phrase of deacons. Lightfoot there suggests the rendering *tale-bearers.* Perhaps *insincere.* *Cf.* **δίγλωσσος**, Prov. xi. 13, etc.

μὴ [k]διλόγους, μὴ [l]οἴνῳ [l]πολλῷ [m]προσέχοντας, μὴ [n]αἰσχροκερδεῖς, 9. ἔχοντας τὸ [o]μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν [p]καθαρᾷ [p]συνειδήσει. 10. καὶ οὗτοι δὲ [q]δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, εἶτα [r]διακονείτωσαν, [s]ἀνέγκλητοι ὄντες. 11. γυναῖκας [h]ὡσαύτως [i]σεμνάς, μὴ [t]διαβόλους,

k Here only, not LXX.
l Tit. ii. 3. *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 23.
m See 1 Tim. i. 4.
n Tit. i. 7, not LXX, *cf.* Tit. i. 11, 1 Pet. v. 2.
o Ver. 16, 1 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 1, Eph. vi. 19, Col. i. 26, 27, ii. 2, iv. 3.
p 2 Tim. i. 3.
q 1 Cor. xi. 28, xvi. 3, 2 Cor. viii. 22, xiii. 5, 1 Thess. ii. 4.
r Acts xix. 22, ver. 13, 1 Pet. iv. 11, not LXX.
s 3 Macc. v. 31, 1 Cor. i. 8, Col. i. 22, Tit. i. 6, 7.
t 2 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. ii. 3.

μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντας: Less ambiguously expressed than **νηφάλιος** in the case of the episcopus. A similar direction is given about women, Tit. ii. 3, **μὴ οἴν. πολ. δεδουλωμένας.**

μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς: This negative qualification is demanded of the episcopus in Tit. i. 7. See reff. The rendering *not greedy of filthy lucre* is unnecessarily strong; the **αἰσχρότης** consists, not in the source whence the gain comes, but in the setting of gain before one as an object in entering the ministry. *Not greedy of gain* expresses the writer's meaning. The **κέρδος** becomes **αἰσχρόν** when a man makes the acquisition of it, rather than the glory of God, his prime object. On the other hand, the special work of deacons was Church finance; and no doubt they had to support themselves by engaging in some secular occupation. They would thus be exposed to temptations to misappropriate Church funds, or to adopt questionable means of livelihood. If such circumstances were contemplated, *not greedy of filthy lucre* might be an allowable rendering. In Crete, the episcopus would seem to have also performed the duties of the deacon; consequently he is required to be **μή αἰσχροκερδής.**

ἔχοντας: See note on chap. i. 19.

Ver. 9. **τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως**: *the faith as revealed*, is the same as **τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον**, ver. 16. In the earlier epistles of St. Paul **τὸ μυστήριον** is *a revealed secret*, in particular, the purpose of God that Jew and Gentile should unite in one Church. The notion of *a secret* is still prominent, because the revelation of it was recent; but just as *revelation* passes from a phase of usage in which the wonderful fact and manner of the disclosure is prominent to a stage in which the content or substance of what has been revealed is alone thought of, so it was with **μυστήριον**; in the Pastorals it means *the revelation given in Christ, the Christian creed* in fact. See Dean Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 234 *sqq.*, and Lightfoot on Col. i. 26. It was not the function of a deacon to teach or preach; it was sufficient if he were a firm believer. **ἐν. καθ. συνειδ.** is connected with **ἔχοντας.** Hort (*Christian Ecclesia*, p. 201) approves of the expl. given by Weiss of **τὸ μυστ. τ. πίστ.**, "the secret constituted by their own inner faith". This seems unnatural.

Ver. 10. **δοκιμαζέσθωσαν**: Chrys. notes that this corresponds to the provision **μὴ νεόφυτον** in the case of the episcopus. This testing of fitness for the office of deacon may have been effected either by (*a*) a period of probationary training,—if the injunction in v. 22, "Lay hands hastily on no man," has reference to ordination, it is another way of saying **δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον,**—or by (*b*) the candidates producing what we should call testimonials of character. Such testimonials would attest that a man was **ἀνέγκλητος,** *i.e.*, that no specific charge of wrong-doing had been laid against him (*unblamed* is Hort's rendering). Until a man has proved his suitability for a post by administering it, this is the most that can be demanded. Each step subjects a man's character to a fresh strain. If he comes out of the trial unscathed, he is entitled to be called **ἀνεπίλημπτος.** It is significant that in Tit. i. 6, 7, where the ordination of presbyters, or episcopi, with no antecedent diaconate is contemplated, this elementary and superficial test, that they should be **ἀνέγκλητοι,** is mentioned. See note on ver. 2. In a normal condition of the Church, episcopi are chosen from those whose fitness is matter of common knowledge.

διακονείτωσαν: For instances of this absolute technical sense of the word see reff.

Ver. 11. **γυναῖκας**: Sc. **δεῖ εἶναι,** not governed by **ἔχοντας** (ver. 9). These are *the deaconesses, ministrae* (Pliny, *Ep.* x. 97) of whom Phoebe (Rom. xvi. 1) is an undoubted example. They performed for the women of the early Church the same sort of ministrations that the deacons did for the men. In confirmation of this

u See ver. 2. [u] νηφαλίους, πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν. 12. διάκονοι ἔστωσαν [v] μιᾶς [v] γυναικὸς
v Ver. 2, Tit. i. 6. [v] ἄνδρες, τέκνων [w] καλῶς [w] προϊστάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἰδίων οἴκων· 13. οἱ
w See ver. 4.
x See ver. 10. γὰρ καλῶς [x] διακονήσαντες [y] βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν [z] περιποιοῦνται
y Here only, N.T. z Luke xvii. 33, Acts xx. 28, 1 Macc. vi. 44, etc.

view it should be noted that **ὡσαύτως** is used in introducing a second or third member of a series. See on ii. 9. The series here is of Church officials. Again, the four qualifications which follow correspond, with appropriate variations, to the first four required in deacons, as regards demeanour, government of the tongue, use of wine, and trustworthiness. And further, this is a section dealing wholly with Church officials. These considerations exclude the view that *women in general*, as R.V. apparently, are spoken of. If *the wives of the deacons* or of the clergy were meant, as A.V., it would be natural to have it unambiguously expressed, *e.g.*, by the addition of **αὐτῶν**.

διαβόλους: *slanderers*. While men are more prone than women to be **δίλογοι**, double-tongued, women are more prone than men to be slanderers. See Tit. ii. 3. The term is predicated in 2 Tim. iii. 3, not of *men*, but as characterising the human race, **ἄνθρωποι**, in the last days.

νηφαλίους: see note on ver. 2.

πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν: It may be that, as Ell. suggests, this has a reference to the function of deaconesses as almoners, a possible inference from *Constt. Apost.* iii. 16. But more probably it is a comprehensive summary with a general reference, like **πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν**, Tit. ii. 10.

Ver. 12. As the episcopi were naturally drawn from the ranks of the deacons, the diaconate was a probation time, in the course of which the personal moral qualifications for the **ἐπισκοπή** might be acquired. See notes on vv. 2 and 4.

Ver. 13. From what has been noted above on St. Paul's teaching in relation to men's lawful aspirations, it will appear that it is not necessary to explain away the obvious meaning of this clause in accordance with a false spirituality which affects to depreciate the inducements of earthly rewards. The parable of the talents (Matt. xxv. 21), implies Christ's approval of reasonable ambition. Nor is this to be answered by a statement that "the recompense of reward" to which we are permitted to look is heavenly and spiritual. For the Christian, there can be no gulf fixed between the earthly and the heavenly; at least in the category of things which are open to him, as a Christian, to desire. The drawing of such distinctions is akin to the Manichaean disparagement of matter.

The **βαθμὸν καλόν** which the man may acquire who has served well as a deacon is *advancement* to the presbyterate or episcopate. So Chrys. The R.V., *gain to themselves a good standing*, does not necessarily imply an advance in rank, but an assured position in the esteem of their fellow-Christians. We know that among the many who possess the same rank, whether in church or state, some from their character and abilities gain a standing that others do not.

Some modern commentators follow Theodoret in giving a purely spiritual force to **βαθμόν**, *i.e.*, **ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι βίῳ**, "a good standing place, *viz.*, at the Great Day" (Alf.); "the step or degree which a faithful discharge of the **διακονία** would gain in the eyes of God" (Ell.). Alf. lays emphasis on the aor. part. as viewing the **διακονία** from the standpoint of the Day of Judgment; but it is equally suitable if the standpoint be that of the day on which they receive their advancement. There is more force in his emphasis on the present, **περιποιοῦνται**, *they are acquiring*. This interpretation does not seem to be in harmony with the context. The qualifications that are noted in ver. 12 have relation to the effectual administration of the Church on earth. It would be harsh to affirm that one who was a digamist and who could not keep his household in order would suffer for it in the Day of Judgment, however unsuitable he might be for office in the church.

πολλὴν παρρησίαν: a Pauline phrase. See reff. In these passages **παρρ.** means *confidence*, without reference to *speech*.

Although Ell. renders the clause "great boldness in the faith that is in Christ Jesus," he explains the boldness as resting on faith in Christ Jesus, and as descriptive of the believer's attitude in regard to, and at, the Day of Judgment. See 1 John iv. 17. If we reject his explanation of **βαθμόν**, it would be natural to interpret **παρρ., κ.τ.λ.**, of a

καὶ [a]πολλὴν [a]παρρησίαν ἐν [b]πίστει [b]τῇ [b]ἐν [b]Χριστῷ [b]Ἰησοῦ. 14. Ταῦτά σοι γράφω, ἐλπίζων ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σὲ[1] [c]ἐν [c]τάχει,[2] 15. ἐὰν δὲ [d]βραδύνω, ἵνα εἰδῇς πῶς δεῖ[3] ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ [e]ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν [f]ἐκκλησία [f]Θεοῦ ζῶντος, στύλος καὶ [g]ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας.

a 2 Cor. iii. 12, vii. 4, Philem. 8. b 2 Tim. iii. 15, *cf.* 2 Tim. i. 13. c Rom. xvi. 20, Luke xviii. 8, Acts xii. 7, xxii. 18, xxv. 4, Rev. i. 1, xxii. 6. d 2 Pet. iii. 9 only, N.T. e 2 Cor. i. 12, Eph. ii. 3, Heb. x. 33, xiii. 18, 1 Pet. i. 17, 2 Pet. ii. 18. f See ver. 5. g Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 37, xv. 58, Col. i. 23.

[1] Om. **πρὸς σὲ** FgrGgr, 67**, two others, arm; f, g ins. after *cito*.
[2] **ἐν τάχει** ACD*P, 17, two others; **τάχιον** ℵDcFGKL.
[3] Ins. **σε** D*, d, f, vg., arm.

confident public expression of the faith, such as would belong to an experienced Christian who had gained a good standing, and had, in consequence, no temptation to be **δίλογος**. Von Soden connects **ἐν πίστει** with **περιποιοῦνται**, *cf.* 2 Tim. i. 13.

Vv. 14-16. These general directions will serve you as a guide in the administration of the Church until you see me. Your charge is one of transcendent importance. The Church is no human institution: it is the household of God, and also the means whereby the power of the Incarnation is available for man's use.

Ver. 14. This verse makes it clear that Timothy's position was a temporary one; he was acting as St. Paul's representative at Ephesus to "put them in remembrance of his ways which be in Christ" (1 Cor. iv. 17).

ταῦτα has a primary reference to the preceding directions regarding public prayers and Church officers; but it naturally includes the following supplementary remarks. For this use of **γράφω**, in place of the epistolary aorist, see especially 2 Cor. xiii. 10, also 1 Cor. xiv. 37, 2 Cor. i. 13, Gal. i. 20.

ἐλπίζων . . . βραδύνω is parenthetical; and expresses at once an excuse for the brevity and incompleteness, from one point of view, of the directions, and also an expectation that they are sufficient to serve their temporary purpose.

ἐν τάχει: **τάχιον**, which is read by Tisch., is, according to Blass (*Grammar*, pp. 33, 141, 142), an instance of the intensive or elative use of the comparative: *cf.* **βέλτιον** 2 Tim. i. 18. This view is rejected by Winer-Moulton (*Grammar*, p. 304) and Ellicott; but their explanations are far-fetched: "More quickly, sooner, than thou wilt need these instructions," "sooner than I anticipate". See also J. H. Moulton, *Grammar*, vol. i. pp. 78, 79, 236.

Ver. 15. **ἵνα εἰδῇς . . . ἀναστρέφεσθαι**: It is a matter of indifference whether we render *how men ought to behave themselves* (R.V.), or *how thou oughtest to behave thyself* (A.V.; R.V. m.). It was Timothy's duty to carry out the apostle's directions, directions relating to the life, **ἀναστροφή**, of the Church. His **ἀναστροφή** would necessarily react on that of the Church. See the Western interpolation in *apparat. crit.*

οἴκῳ θεοῦ: *the household*, perhaps, rather than *the house, of God*. In view of the prevailing paucity of articles in these Epistles, one cannot lay stress on the absence of **τῷ** before **οἴκῳ**, so as to render, *a house of God such as is the Church, etc.* **οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ** is always found elsewhere. The Church is God's **οἶκος**, Heb. iii. 6; God's **κατοικητήριον**, Eph. ii. 22; a **ναὸς ἅγιος**, Eph. ii. 21; **ναὸς θεοῦ**, 1 Cor. iii. 16, 2 Cor. vi. 16; a **μεγάλη οἰκία**, of which God is the **δεσπότης**, 2 Tim. ii. 20; an **οἶκος πνευματικός**, 1 Pet. ii. 5.

The body of the Church, **τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν**, is a **ναὸς ἁγίου πνεύματος** (1 Cor. vi. 19); and the human body of Jesus was a **ναός** (John ii. 21); but it is not in accordance with Scriptural language so to describe the body of any individual Christian.

οἴκῳ . . . ἥτις: "The noun which forms the predicate in a relative sentence, annexed for the purpose of explanation (**ὅς . . . ἐστίν**), sometimes gives its own gender and number to the relative, by a kind of attraction" (Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 206).

θεοῦ ζῶντος: A constant phrase, occurring again iv. 10.

στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα κ.τ.λ.: The view of Gregory Nyssen and Greg. Naz. that **στύλος** here refers to Timothy does not need refutation, although an early reference to this passage in the Letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (Eus.

16. καὶ [h] ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς [i] εὐσεβείας [k] μυστήριον· ὃς [l] [l] ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, [m] ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, [n] ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις,

h Here only, N.T., 4 Macc. (3).
i See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
k See note.
l John i. 31. Heb. ix. 26, 1 Pet. i. 20, 1 John i. 2, iii. 5, 8.
m Ps. l. (li.) 6, Matt. xi. 19 = Luke vii. 35, Luke vii. 29.
n Luke xxiv. 34, Acts ix. 17, xiii. 31, xxvi. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 5, 6, 7, 8, Heb. ix. 28.

[1] So ℵ*cA*C*FgrGgr, 17, 73, 181, sah., boh., syrhcl-mg, go., Or.int, Epiph., Theod. Mops., Cyr. Al. Liberatus Diaconus (circ. 560 A.D.), *Breviarium causae Nest. et Eutych.*, 19, says, "Hoc tempore Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus, ab imperatore Anastasio dicitur expulsus, tanquam evangelia falsasset, & maxime illud apostoli dictum: *qui apparuit in carne, justificatus est in spiritu.* Hunc enim immutasse, ubi habet **ὃς**, id est, *qui*, monosyllabum graecum, littera mutata **O** in **Θ** vertisse, & fecisse, **ΘC**, id est *deus*, ut esset *Deus apparuit per carnem*"; a relative is found in syrpesh, syrhcl-txt, arm., all Latin Fathers; **ὃ** D*, *quod*, d, f, g, vg.; **θεὸς** ℵe(xii/)CcDcKLP, Chrys., Thdrt., Euthalius, Damasc., Thphl., Oec., Didymus, Greg. Nyss.

H. E. v. 1) applies **στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα** to the martyr Attalus. **στύλος** has of course a personal reference in Gal. ii. 9; *cf.* also Rev. iii. 12; but it is childish to suppose that metaphors have a constant value in the Bible. Holtzmann's suggestion that **στύλος** is in apposition to **θεοῦ** is rightly rejected by von Soden.

The clause is, of course, in apposition to **ἐκκλησία** which is by a kindred metaphor called in 2 Tim. ii. 19 **ὁ στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ θεοῦ.** This latter passage suggests that we should here render **ἑδραίωμα** *ground* or *basis* rather than *stay* (R.V. m.). **ἑδραῖος** is rendered *steadfast* elsewhere. See reff. and especially Col. i. 23 (**τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἑδραῖοι**), *ctr.* Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 174.

The truth, **ἡ ἀλήθεια,** has, as has been already stated, a technical Christian connotation in the Pastorals, and has not a wider reference than the Christian revelation, which is *the truth* in so far as it has been revealed. The Church, of the old covenant or of the new, is the divinely constituted human Society by which the support and maintenance in the world of revealed truth is conditioned. Truth if revealed to isolated individuals, no matter how numerous, would be dissipated in the world. But the Divine Society, in which it is given an objective existence, at once compels the world to take knowledge of it, and assures those who receive the revelation that it is independent of, and external to, themselves, and not a mere fancy of their own.

Bengel puts a full stop at **ζῶντος** and removes it after **ἀληθείας**, making **τὸ . . . μυστήριον** the subject of the sentence, and **στύλος . . . μέγα** the predicate, The mystery, etc., is the pillar, etc., and confessedly great," **μέγα** being used as in 1 Cor. ix. 11, 2 Cor. xi. 15, the whole expression being equivalent to **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος.** He quotes from Rabbi Levi Barcelonita and Maimonides parallel expressions concerning precepts of the Law, "*fundamentum magnum et columna valida legis*," and a striking phrase from Irenæus, *Haer.* iii. 11, 8, *Columna autem et firmamentum ecclesiae est evangelium*, **στύλος δὲ καὶ στήριγμα ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.**

Ver. 16. The connexion of thought lies in a feeling that the lofty terms in which the Church has been just spoken of may demand a justification. *The truth* of which the Church is **στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα** is not a light thing nor an insubstantial fabric; *the truth* is, more expressly, **τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον,** *the revelation to man of practical religion;* and, beyond yea or nay, this truth, this revelation, is great. Whether you believe it or not, you cannot deny that the claims of Christianity are tremendous.

μέγας is rare in Paul: (Rom. ix. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 11, xvi. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 15; Eph. v. 32; 1 Tim. vi. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 20; Tit. ii. 13). The nearest parallel to the present passage is Eph. v. 32, **τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν.** See note on ver. 9. On **εὐσέβεια**, see chap. ii. 2.

If we assume that **ὅς** is the right reading, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that what follows is a quotation by St. Paul from a primitive creed or summary of the chief facts to be believed about Jesus Christ. And one is tempted to conjecture that another fragment of the same summary is quoted in 1 Pet. iii. 18, **θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι. ὅς,** then, does not form part of the quotation at all; it is simply intro-

[o] ἐκηρύχθη [o] ἐν [o] ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, [p] ἀνελήμφθη [q] ἐν

o Gal. ii. 2, *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 19, Col. i. 23. p Mark xvi. 19, Acts i. 2, 11, 22. q Luke ix. 31, 1 Cor. xv. 43, Phil. iv. 19, Col. iii. 4.

ductory, and relative to the subject, Jesus Christ, whose personality was, in some terms, expressed in an antecedent sentence which St. Paul has not quoted.

As the passage stands, there are three pairs of antithetic thoughts: (1) (*a*) the flesh and (*b*) the spirit of Christ, (2) (*a*) angels and (*b*) Gentiles—the two extremes of the rational creation, (3) (*a*) the world and (*b*) glory. In another point of view, there is a connexion between 2 *a* and 3 *b*, and between 2 *b* and 3 *a*. Again, we may say that we have here set forth (1) the Incarnation in itself, (2) its manifestation, (3) its consequence or result, as affecting man and God.

The antithesis between the **σάρξ** and **πνεῦμα** of Christ is drawn, in addition to 1 Pet. iii. 18, also in Rom. i. 3, 4. **τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης.** We cannot leave out of account in discussing these passages the parallel in 1 Pet. iv. 6, **εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι.** The **πνεῦμα** of Christ, as man, in these passages means His human spirit, the naturally permanent spiritual part of a human personality. See also 1 Cor. v. 5.

ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί: He who had been from all eternity "in the form of God" became cognisable by the limited senses of human beings, **ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας** (Rom. viii. 3), became *manifest in the flesh*, **σὰρξ ἐγένετο** (John i. 14). **φανεροῦν** is used in connexion with Christ in four associations in the N.T. :—

(1) as here, of the objective fact of the Incarnation: John i. 31 (?), Heb. ix. 26, 1 Pet. i. 20, 1 John i. 2 (bis), iii. 5, 8.

(2) of the revelation involved in the Incarnation: Rom. xvi. 26, Col. i. 26, iv. 4, 2 Tim. i. 10, Tit. i. 3. N.B. in Rom. and Col. the verb is used of a **μυστήριον**.

(3) of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ, which were, in a sense, repetitions of the marvel of the Incarnation, as being manifestations of the unseen: Mark xvi. 12, 14, John xxi. 1 (bis), 14.

(4) of the Second Coming, which will be, as far as man can tell, His final manifestation: Col. iii. 4, 1 Pet. v. 4, 1 John ii. 28, iii. 2.

ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι: *proved* or *pronounced to be righteous in His higher nature*. The best parallel to this use of **δικαιοῦν** is Ps. l. (li.) 6, **ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου**, also Matt. xi. 19 = Luke vii. 35. We are not entitled to assume that the **ἐν** has the same force before **πνεύματι** that it has before **σαρκί**; the repetition of the preposition is due to a felt need of rhythmic effect. If we are asked, When did this **δικαίωσις** take place? we reply that it was on a review of the whole of the Incarnate Life. The heavenly voice, **ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα**, heard by human ears at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration, might have been heard at any moment during the course of those "sinless years". He was emphatically **ὁ δίκαιος** (Acts iii. 14, xxii. 14; 1 John ii. 1. See also Matt. iii. 15; John xvi. 10.) It is enough to mention without discussion the opinions that **πνεύματι** refers (*a*) to the Holy Spirit, or (*b*) to the Divine Personality of Christ.

ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις: Ellicott points out that in these three pairs of clauses, the first member of each group points to *earthly* relations, the second to *heavenly*. So that these words **ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις** refer to the fact that the Incarnation was "a spectacle to angels" as well as "to men"; or rather, as Dean Bernard notes (*Comm. in loc.*), **ὤφθη** and **ἐκηρύχθη** mark the difference in the communication of the Christian Revelation to angels—the rational creatures nearest to God—and to the Gentiles—farthest from God. "The revelation to Gentiles is *mediate*, by preaching . . . ; the revelation to the higher orders of created intelligences is *immediate*, by vision." It was as much a source of wonderment to the latter as to the former. See 1 Pet. i. 12. The angels who greeted the Birth (Luke ii. 13), who ministered at the temptations (Matt. iv. 11, Mark i. 13), strengthened Him in His agony (Luke xxii. 43), proclaimed His Resurrection and stood by at the Ascension, are only glimpses to us of "a cloud of witnesses" of whose presence Jesus was always conscious (Matt. xxvi. 53).

ὤφθη is usually used of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ to *men*. See reff.

ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ: This was in itself a miracle. See 2 Thess. i. 10, John xvii. 21.

IV. 1. Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα [a] ῥητῶς λέγει ὅτι ἐν [b] ὑστέροις καιροῖς
[a] Here only, not LXX. [b] Matt. xxi. [c] ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς πίστεως, [d] προσέχοντες πνεύμασι [e] πλάνοις [1]
[c] Luke viii. 13, 2 Tim. ii. 19, Heb. iii. 12. [d] See 1 Tim. i. 4. [e] Here only as adj., *cf.* 2 John 7, Eph. iv. 14, 2 Thess. ii. 11. [f] 2 Macc. vi. 25, Gal. ii. 13, Matt. xxiii. 28, Mark xii. 15, Luke xii. 1, 1 Pet. ii. 1.
[g] Here only, not LXX. [h] Here only, not LXX.
31 only, N.T.
καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων 2. ἐν [f] ὑποκρίσει [g] ψευδολόγων, [h] κεκαυ-

[1] πλάνης P, 31, 37, twenty-four others, vg. (*erroris*), go., arm.

Winer-Moulton notes (*Grammar*, p. 326) that ἐπιστεύθη cannot be referred to πιστεύειν Χῷ but presupposes the phrase πιστ. Χόν. *Cf.* 2 Thess. i. 10.

ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ: This is the verb used of the Ascension. See reff. *Cf.* ἀνάλημψις Luke ix. 51.

ἐν δόξῃ: ἐν has, in this case, a pregnant sense, εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν δόξῃ (Ell.). See also reff., in which ἐν δόξῃ is a personal attribute of the glory that surrounds and transfigures a glorified spiritual person; but in this place δόξα means the place or state of glory; *cf.* Luke xxiv. 26, ἔδει . . . τὸν Χριστόν . . . εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1-5. Over against the future triumph of the truth, assured to us by the finished work of Christ, we must set the opposition, grievous at present, of the Spirit of error. His attacks have been foreseen by the Spirit of holiness. They are just now expressed in a false spirituality which condemns God's good creatures of marriage and food.

Ver. 1. τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα: The Apostle here passes to another theme, the manifestation of religion in daily life. The connexion between this section and the last is as indicated above. There is a slightly adversative force in the connecting δέ.

The Spirit is the Holy Spirit Who speaks through the prophets of the New Dispensation, of whom St. Paul was one. Here, if the following prophetical utterance be his own, he speaks as if Paul under the prophetic influence had an activity independent of Paul the apostle.

ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς: *The latter times*, of course, may be said to come before *the last days*, ἔσχαται ἡμέραι (Isa. ii. 2, Acts ii. 17, Jas. v. 3, 2 Pet. iii. 3; καιρὸς ἔσχατος, 1 Pet. i. 5; ἔσχ. χρόνος, Jude 18).

But a comparison with 2 Tim. iii. 1, a passage very similar in tone to this, favours the opinion that the terms were not so distinguished by the writers of the N.T. In this sort of prophetical warning or denunciation, we are not intended to take the future tense too strictly. Although the prophet intends to utter a warning concerning the future, yet we know that what he declares will be hereafter he believes to be already in active operation. It is a convention of prophetical utterance to denounce sins and sinners of one's own time (τινες) under the form of a predictive warning. *Cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 3, ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς, κ.τ.λ. It gives an additional impressiveness to the arraignment, to state that the guilty persons are partners in the great apostacy, the culmination of the world's revolt from God.

τινες is intentionally vague. See note on 1 Tim. i. 3. It is not used, as in Rom. iii. 3, of an indefinite number.

πνεύμασι πλάνοις: As the Church is guided aright by the Spirit of truth, He is opposed in His beneficent ministrations by the Spirit of error, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης (1 John iv. 6), who is τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου, whose agents work through individuals, the "many false prophets who have gone out into the world" (1 John iv. 1).

διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων must be, in this context, *doctrines taught by demons*, a σοφία δαιμονιώδης (Jas. iii. 15). See Tert. *de Praescr. Haeret.* 7. The phrase does not here mean *doctrines about demons*, demonology. Still less are heresiarchs here called *demons*. This is the only occurrence of δαιμόνιον in the Pastorals. In Acts xvii. 18 the word has its neutral classical meaning, "a divine being," see also ver. 22; but elsewhere in the N.T. it has the LXX reference to evil spirits. For διδασκ. see note on chap. i. 10.

Ver. 2. ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων: The three genitives ψευδολ. κεκαυστ. κωλ. are coordinate, and refer to the human agents of the seducing spirits and demons. ἐν ὑποκρίσει depends on πνεύμασι and διδασκαλίαις. The spirits work, and the teachings are exhibited, in the hypocrisy of them that speak lies; and this hypocrisy finds detailed expression in regulations suggested by a false asceticism.

στηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν, 3. κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, [l] ἀπέχεσθαι [i] Acts xv. 20, 29, 1 Thess. iv. 3, 1 Pet. ii. 11. [k] βρωμάτων ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς [l] μετάλημψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τοῖς

k Rom. xiv. 15, 20, 1 Cor. viii. 8, 13, Heb. xiii. 9. l Here only, not LXX.

Although the **ψευδολόγοι** are included in the **τινες . . . προσέχοντες**, yet there is a large class of persons who are merely deceived; who are not actively deceiving others, and who have not taken the initiative in deceit. These latter are the **ψευδολόγοι**. For this reason it is better to connect **ἐν ὑποκρίσει** with **προσέχοντες** (Ell., von Soden) rather than with **ἀποστήσονται** (Bengel, Alf.), though no doubt both verbs refer to the same class.

ἐν ὑποκρίσει of course is not adverbial as A.V., *speaking lies in hypocrisy*. This could only be justified if **ψευδολόγων** referred to **δαιμονίων**. The absence of an article before **ὑποκρίσει** need cause no astonishment.

ψευδολόγων: This word expresses perhaps more than **ψεύστης** the notion of definite false statements. A man might be on some occasions and on special points a **ψευδολόγος**, *a speaker of that which is not true*, and yet not deserve to be classed as a **ψεύστης**, *a liar*.

κεκαυστηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν: These speakers of falsehood are radically unsound. They are in worse case than the unsophisticated heathen whose conscience bears witness with the law of God (Rom. ii. 15). The conscience of these men is perverted. **κεκαυστ.** may mean that they are *past feeling*, **ἀπηλγηκότες** (Eph. iv. 19), that *their conscience is callous* from constant violation, as skin grows hard from searing (A.V., R.V. m., so Theodoret); or it may mean that these men *bore branded on their conscience the ownership marks of the Spirit of evil*, the devil's seal (ctr. 2 Tim. ii. 19), so perhaps R.V.; as St. Paul "bore branded on his body the marks of Jesus" (Gal. vi. 17), as "Christ's bondservant" (1 Cor. vii. 22). (So Theophylact). Either of these interpretations is more attractive than that of Bengel, followed by Alford, who takes it to mean that *the marks of crime are burnt into them*, so that they are self-condemned. See Tit. i. 15, iii. 11.

There is no special force in **ἰδίαν** (see on chap. iii. 4), as though a course of deceiving others should, by a righteous judgment, result in a loss to themselves of moral sensitiveness.

Ver. 3. **κωλυόντων γαμεῖν**: Spurious asceticism, in this and other departments of life, characterised the Essenes (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 2) and the Therapeutae (Philo *Vit. Contempl.* § 4), and all the other false spiritualists of the East; so that this feature does not supply a safe ground for fixing the date of the epistle. At the same time, it is not likely that this particular heresy was present to St. Paul's mind when he was writing 1 Cor. vii. 25-40; see especially 38, **ὁ μὴ γαμίζων κρεῖσσον ποιήσει**; but similar views are condemned in Col., see especially Col. ii. 16, 21, 22. See also Heb. xiii., iv. St. Paul had come to realise how tyrannous the weak brother could be; and he had become less tolerant of him.

ἀπέχεσθαι: The positive **κελευόντων**, *commanding*, must be supplied from the negative **κελευόντων μή**, *commanding not* = **κωλυόντων**.

d. f. g. Vulg. preserve the awkwardness of the Greek, *prohibentium nubere, abstinere a cibis*. But Faustus read *abstinentes*, and Origen int. *et abstinentes se a cibis*. Epiphanius inserts **παραγγέλλουσιν** after **βρωμ.**, and Isidore inserts **καὶ κελευόντων** before **ἀπεχ.**, which was also suggested by Bentley. Theophylact inserts similarly **συμβουλευόντων**. Hort conjectures that **ἀπέχεσθαι** is a primitive corruption for **ἢ ἅπτεσθαι** or **καὶ γεύεσθαι**. He maintains that "no Greek usage will justify or explain this combination of two infinitives, adverse to each other in the tenor of their sense, under the one verb **κωλυόντων**; and their juxtaposition without a conjunction in a sentence of this kind is at least strange". Blass, however (*Grammar*, p. 291) alleges as a parallel **κωλύσει ἐνεργεῖν καὶ** [*sc.* **ποιήσει**] **ζημιοῦν** from Lucian, *Charon*, § 2. Another instance of zeugma, though not so startling as this, is in ii. 12, **οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω . . . εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.** See also 1 Cor. x. 24, xiv. 34 (T.R.). For **ἀπέχεσθαι**, as used in this connexion, see reff.

ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν, κ.τ.λ.: It has been asked why St. Paul does not justify by specific reasons the use of marriage, as he does the use of food. The answer seems to be that the same general argument applies to both. The final cause of both is the same, *i.e.*, to keep the race alive; and man is not entitled to place restrictions on the use of either, other than those which can be shown to be in accordance with God's law.

m *Cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 4.
n Jas. i. 18. Rev. v. 13, viii. 9.
o Here only, not LXX.
p Mark xv. 23, John xiii. 30, xix. 30, Acts ix. 19, Rev. xxii. 17.
q See 1 Tim. ii. 1.

m πιστοῖς καὶ m ἐπεγνωκόσι m τὴν m ἀλήθειαν. 4. ὅτι πᾶν n κτίσμα
n Θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν o ἀπόβλητον μετὰ εὐχαριστίας p λαμβανόμενον·
5. ἁγιάζεται γὰρ διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ q ἐντεύξεως. 6. Ταῦτα

μετάλημψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας is one complex conception. This expresses the ideal use, truly dignified and human, of food. See Rom. xiv. 6, **ὁ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ ἐσθίει, εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ θεῷ**; and 1 Cor. x. 30, **εἰ ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω, τί βλασφημοῦμαι ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εὐχαριστῶ**; St. Paul of course does not mean that believers only are intended by God to partake of food. His argument is an *à fortiori* one. "Those that believe," etc., are certainly included in God's intention. He who makes His sun to rise on the evil is certainly well pleased to make it rise on the good.

Again, St. Paul does not merely desire to vindicate the use of some of God's creatures for them that believe, but the use of *all* of God's creatures, so far as they are not physically injurious. "God saw *every thing* that he had made, and behold, it was very good," **καλὰ λίαν** (Gen. i. 31).

For the association of **μετάλημψις** compare the phrase **μεταλαμβάνειν τροφῆς**, Acts ii. 46, and reff. on 2 Tim. ii. 6.

τοῖς πιστοῖς: *dat. commodi*, as in Tit. i. 15, where see note.

τὴν ἀλήθειαν means, as elsewhere in these epistles, the Gospel truth in general, not the truth of the following statement, **πᾶν κτίσμα, κ.τ.λ.**

Ver. 4. **ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα**: This is the proof of the preceding statement, consisting of (*a*) a plain reference to Gen. i. 31, (*b*) a no less clear echo of our Lord's teaching, Mark vii. 15 (Acts x. 15), also re-echoed in Rom. xiv. 14, Tit. i. 15.

λαμβανόμενον: This verb is used of taking food into one's hand before eating (in the accounts of the feeding of the multitudes, Matt. xiv. 19 = Mark vi. 41; Matt. xv. 36 = Mark viii. 6, also Luke xxiv. 30, 43) as well as of eating and drinking. See reff. Perhaps it is not fanciful to note its special use in connexion with the Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 23; Matt. xxvi. 26 (bis) 27; Mark xiv. 22, 23; Luke xxii. 19).

καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον: The statement of Gen. i. 31 which is summed up in *Every creature of God is good* might be met by the objection that nevertheless certain kinds of food were, in point of fact, to be *rejected* by the express command of the Mosaic Law. St. Paul replies that *thanksgiving* disannuls the Law in each particular case. Nothing over which thanksgiving can be pronounced is any longer included in the category of things tabooed. It is evident, from the repetition of the condition, **μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβ.**, that St. Paul regarded that as the only restriction on Christian liberty in the use of God's creatures. Is it a thing of such a kind that I can, without incongruity, give thanks for it?

Field regards **οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον** here as a proverbial adaptation of Homer's saying (*Il.* Γ. 65): **οὗτοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα.**

For **κτίσμα** see reff. **κτίσις** is found in Rom. (7), 2 Cor. (1), Gal. (1), Col. (2); but in these places *creation* is the best or a possible rendering. **κτίσμα** means unambiguously *thing created.*

Ver. 5. **ἁγιάζεται**: The use of the present tense here supports the explanation given of ver. 4, and helps to determine the sense in which **λόγος θεοῦ** is used. The food lying before me at this moment, which to some is **ἀπόβλητος**, is sanctified here and now by the **εὐχαριστία.** See 1 Cor. x. 30.

λόγος θεοῦ and **ἔντευξις** (see note on ii. 1) are in some sense co-ordinate (almost a hendiadys), and together form elements in a **εὐχαριστία.** If St. Paul had meant by **λόγος θεοῦ**, the general teaching of Scripture, or the particular text, Gen. i. 31, he must have said **ἡγίασται.** At the same time, the written word was an element in the notion of the writer. **λόγος θεοῦ** has not here merely its general sense, a divine communication to man; it rather determines the quality of the **ἔντευξις**, as *a scriptural prayer; a prayer in harmony with God's revealed truth.* The examples that have come down to us of grace before meat are, as Dean Bernard notes here, "packed with scriptural phrases".

The best commentary on this verse is the action of St. Paul himself on the ship, when, having "taken bread, he gave thanks to God in the presence of all; and he brake it, and began to eat" (Acts xxvii. 35).

Although there is not here any direct

[r] ὑποτιθέμενος τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καλὸς ἔσῃ διάκονος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,[1] [s] ἐντρεφόμενος τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας ἧ[2] [t] παρηκολούθηκας.[3] 7. τοὺς δὲ [u] βεβήλους καὶ [v] γραώδεις

r Here only (N.T.) in this sense.
s Here only, not LXX.
t Luke i. 3.
2 Tim. iii. 10. u See 1 Tim. i. 9. v Here only, not LXX.

[1] Ἰησ. Χριστ. Dc, 17, 31, 47, many others, am., syrpesh.
[2] ἧς A, 80, one other.
[3] So ℵADKLP; παρηκολούθησας CFG.

reference to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, it is probable that thoughts about it have influenced the language; for the Eucharist is the supreme example of all benedictions and consecrations of material things. And if this be so, the passage has light thrown on it by the language of Justin Martyr and Irenæus about the Prayer of Consecration; *e.g.*, Justin, *Apol.* i. 66. "As Jesus Christ our Saviour, by the word of God (**διὰ λόγου θεοῦ**) made flesh, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have been taught that *the food over which thanks have been given by the word of prayer which comes from him* (**τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν**)—that food from which our blood and flesh are by assimilation nourished—is both the flesh and the blood of that Jesus who was made flesh". Similarly Irenæus (*Haer.* v. 2, 3), "Both the mingled cup, and the bread which has been made, receives upon itself *the word of God*, and the Eucharist becomes the body of Christ" (**ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ**). Perhaps by *the word of prayer which comes from him* Justin means a formula authorised by Christ. It must be added that the Prayer Book of Serapion, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, *circ.* A.D. 380, contains an *epiclesis* in which we read, "O God of truth, let thy holy Word come to sojourn on this bread, that the bread may become Body of the Word, and on this cup, that the cup may become Blood of the Truth" (Bishop J. Wordsworth's trans.).

A comparison of these passages suggests an association in the thought of the primitive Church of the Holy Spirit and the **λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ**.

Vv. 6-10. The spread of these mischievous notions among the brethren is most effectively discouraged by a demonstration in the person of the minister himself of the positive teaching of the Gospel as to practical life. We are assured, and declare our confidence by our lives, that Christianity differs essentially from theosophy in that it has respect to the eternal future, as well as to the passing present.

Ver. 6. **ταῦτα**: repeated in ver. 11, refers to all the preceding directions, but more especially to the warnings against false asceticism.

ὑποτιθέμενος: (*remind, suggest*) is a somewhat mild term, as Chrys. points out; but in some circumstances suggestion is more effectual than direct exhortation.

διάκονος Χρ. Ἰησ. seems emphatic, a deacon, not of the Church, but of Christ Jesus, who is the Chief Pastor.

ἐντρεφόμενος: The present tense is significant, "meaning to imply constancy in application to these things" (Chrys.), "ever training thyself" (Alf.). "The present . . . marks a continuous and permanent nutrition" (Ell.). The process begun from his earliest years, 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15, was being still maintained.

ἡ πίστις and **ἡ διδασκαλία** denote respectively the sum total of Christian belief, conceived as an ideal entity, and the same as imparted little by little to the faithful. See note on i. 10.

ᾗ παρηκολούθηκας: There is a similar use of this verb in 2 Tim. iii. 10, where see note. Alford attempts to give the word here the same force as in Luke i. 3, by rendering *the course of which thou hast followed*. The A.V., *whereunto thou hast attained*, expresses also the sense of achievement which we find in Luke *l.c.* It seems better, however, to associate the word with the notion of discipleship; so R.V., *doctrine which thou hast followed until now*.

Ver. 7. W. H. place a comma after **παρηκολούθηκας** and a full stop after **παραιτοῦ**; so R.V. nearly. But as **παραιτοῦ** is an imperative, as in reff. in Pastorals, it is best taken as antithetic to **γύμναζε**.

γραώδεις: The **μῦθοι**, in addition to their profane nature, as impeaching the

[w] μύθους [x] παραιτοῦ, [y] γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς [z] εὐσέβειαν· 8. ἡ γὰρ [a] σωματικὴ [b] γυμνασία [c] πρὸς [c] ὀλίγον ἐστὶν [d] ὠφέλιμος· ἡ δὲ [z] εὐσέβεια πρὸς πάντα [d] ὠφέλιμός ἐστιν, [e f] ἐπαγγελίαν [e] ἔχουσα [f] ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης. 9. [g] πιστὸς [g] ὁ [g] λόγος [g] καὶ [g] πάσης [g] ἀποδοχῆς [g] ἄξιος. 10. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ[1] [h] κοπιῶμεν καὶ

w See 1 Tim. i. 4. x 1 Tim. v. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 10, Heb. xii. 25. y 2 Macc. x. 15, Heb. v. 14, xii. 11, 2 Pet. ii. 14. z See 1 Tim. ii. 2. a 4 Macc. i. 32, iii. 1, Luke iii. 22. b 4 Macc. xi. 20 only. c Jas. iv. 14. d 2 Tim. iii. 16, Tit. iii. 8, not LXX. e *Cf.* Different use in 2 Cor. vii. 1, Heb. vii. 6. f 2 Tim. i. 1. g See 1 Tim. i. 15. h Matt. xi. 28, Col. i. 29, Phil. ii. 16, *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 17.

[1] Ins. καὶ FgrGKL.

goodness of the Creator, were absurd, unworthy of a grown man's consideration. See note on chap. i. 4. Hort's view (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 138) that **βεβήλους** here merely means "the absence of any divine or sacred character" does not seem reasonable.

παραιτοῦ: *refuse, turn away from*, as in Heb. xii. 25. Alf. renders *excuse thyself from*, as in Luke xiv. 18 (bis), 19. *Decline* would be a better rendering. In addition to the reff. given above, **παραιτέομαι** occurs in Mark xv. 6, Acts xxv. 11 (a speech of St. Paul's), Heb. xii. 19.

γύμναζε: There is here an intentional paradox. Timothy is to meet the spurious asceticism of the heretics by *exercising himself in the practical piety of the Christian life*. See chap. ii. 2. The paradox is comparable to **φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν** of 1 Thess. iv. 11. The true Christian asceticism is not essentially **σωματική**, although the body is the means by which the spiritual nature is affected and influenced. Although it brings the body into subjection (1 Cor. ix. 27), this is a means, not an end in itself.

Ver. 8. **σωματικὴ γυμνασία**: The parallel cited by Lightfoot (*Philippians*, p. 290) from Seneca (*Ep. Mor.* xv. 2, 5) renders it almost certain that the primary reference is to gymnastic exercises (as Chrys., etc., take it); but there is as certainly in **σωματικὴ γυμνασία** a connotation of ascetic practices as the outward expression of the theories underlying the fables of ver. 7. **παραιτοῦ** elsewhere in the Pastorals is followed by reasons why the particular thing or person should be avoided. The teaching is identical with that in Col. ii. 23. St. Paul makes his case all the stronger by conceding that an asceticism which terminates in the body is of some use. The contrast then is not so much between *bodily exercise*, commonly so called, and *piety*, as between *piety* (which includes a discipline of the body) and an absurd and profane theosophy of which discipline of the body was the chief or only practical expression.

πρὸς ὀλίγον: *to a slight extent;* as contrasted with **πρὸς πάντα**. **πρὸς ὀλίγον** means *for a little while* in Jas. iv. 14. This notion is included in the other. The R.V., *for a little* is ambiguous; perhaps intentionally so. In view of the genuine asceticism of St. Paul himself, not to mention other examples, it is unreasonable to think him inconsistent in making this concession.

ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς; If we take **ἐπαγγελία** to signify *the thing promised* (as in Luke xxiv. 49, Acts i. 4, xiii. 32), rather than *a promise*, we can give an appropriate force to the rest of the sentence. A consistent Christian walk possesses, does not forfeit, that which this life promises; in a very real sense "it makes the best of both worlds". **ἔχω** will then have its usual meaning; and **ζωῆς** is the genitive of possession, as in Luke xxiv. 49, Acts i. 4 (**ἐπ. τοῦ πατρός**). It is not the genitive of apposition, *piety promises life*. That which is given by life to Christians is the best thing that life has to give. Von Soden compares **πάντα ὑμῶν**, 1 Cor. iii. 21 sq. Bacon's saying "Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament; Adversity is the blessing of the New" is only half a truth. If religion does not make us happy in this life, we have needlessly missed our inheritance (see Matt. vi. 33; Mark x. 30). On the other hand, though piety does bring happiness in this life, the exercise of it deliberately with that end in view is impious; as Whately said, "Honesty is the best policy, but the man who is honest for that reason is not honest".

Ver. 9. **πιστὸς—ἄξιος**: This is parenthetical and retrospective. The teaching of ver. 8 is the **λόγος**. So Chrys.

Ver. 10. **γὰρ**, as in the parallel 2

[i] ἀγωνιζόμεθα,[1] ὅτι [k] ἠλπίκαμεν[2] ἐπὶ Θεῷ ζῶντι, ὅς ἐστιν [l] σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν. 11. [m] Παράγγελλε ταῦτα καὶ διδάσκε. 12. μηδείς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονείτω, ἀλλὰ [n] τύπος

i 1 Cor. ix. 25, Col. i. 29, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 7.
k John v. 45, 2 Cor. i. 10, 1 Tim. v. 5, vi. 17.
l See 1 Tim. i. 1.
m See 1 Tim. i. 3.
n 1 Cor. x. 6, Phil. iii. 17, 1 Thess. i. 7, 2 Thess. iii. 9, Tit. ii. 7, 1 Pet. v. 3.

[1] So ℵ*ACFᵉʳGᵉʳK, 17, 31, 47, five others; ὀνειδιζόμεθα ℵᶜDLP, d, f, g, vg., go., syrr., boh., arm.

[2] ἠλπίσαμεν D*, 17.

Tim. ii. 11, introduces a statement in support of the judgment, **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος**.

εἰς τοῦτο: *i.e.*, with a view to the obtaining the promised blessings of life. The best commentary on this is what St. Paul said in an earlier epistle, "As sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things" (2 Cor. vi. 10).

κοπιῶμεν καὶ ἀγωνιζόμεθα express St. Paul's personal experience of what the profession of Christianity involved. It was then an almost universal experience, see Acts xiv. 22; but is not of necessity a concomitant of the exercising of oneself to godliness. The two words are similarly combined Col. i. 29, **εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος**. **κοπιᾶν** is usually used by St. Paul of ministerial labours: his own, 1 Cor. xv. 10, Gal. iv. 11, and those of others, Rom. xvi. 12, 1 Cor. xvi. 16, 1 Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17; but this restriction is not necessary, nor would it be suitable here. See reff.

For **ὀνειδιζόμεθα** (var. lect.) *cf.* Matt. v. 11=Luke vi. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 14.

ὅτι ἠλπίκαμεν, κ.τ.λ.: This was at once an incentive to exertion, and thus correlative to **ἐπαγγελία ζωῆς**, and in itself a part of the thing promised, the **ἐπαγγελία**. A consciousness that we are in an harmonious personal relation with the living God lifts us into a sphere in which labour and striving have no power to distress us.

ἠλπίκαμεν: *we have our hope set on* (R.V.). The same use of the perfect of this verb, "expressing the continuance and permanence of the **ἐλπίς**" (Ell.), is found in the reff. In addition, **ἐλπίζω** is also followed by **ἐπί** with the dat. in Rom. xv. 12 (Isa. xi. 10) and 1 Tim. vi. 17; by **ἐπί** with the acc. in 1 Tim. v. 5, 1 Pet. i. 13; by **εἰς** with an acc. in John v. 45, 2 Cor. i. 10, 1 Pet. iii. 5; and by **ἐν** followed by the dat. in 1 Cor. xv. 19.

θεῷ ζῶντι: As indicated above, this is said in relation to **ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς**. To know the living God is life eternal (John xvii. 3).

ὅς ἐστιν σωτὴρ πάντων, κ.τ.λ.: *Saviour of all* (**τὸν πάντων σωτῆρα**) occurs in Wisd. xvi. 7. *Cf. Saviour of the world*, John iv. 42.

The *prima facie* force of **μάλιστα** certainly is that all men share in some degree in that salvation which the **πιστοί** enjoy in the highest degree. Compare the force of **μάλιστα** in Acts xxv. 26, Gal. vi. 10, Phil. iv. 22, 1 Tim. v. 8, 17, 2 Tim. iv. 13; Tit. i. 10.

The statement is more unreservedly universalist in tone than chap. ii. 4 and Tit. ii. 11; and perhaps must be qualified by saying that while God is potentially Saviour of all, He is actually Saviour of the **πιστοί**. It is an argument *a minori ad majus* (as Bengel says); and the unqualified assertion is suitable. If all men can be saved, surely the **πιστοί** are saved, in whose number we are included. It is better to qualify the statement thus than, with Chrys. and Bengel, to give to **σωτήρ** a material sense of God's relation to all men, as the God of nature; but a spiritual sense of His relation to them that believe, as the God of grace. See notes on ch. i. 1; ii. 4.

Vv. 11-16. Silent example or mild suggestion will not do in every case. There are many occasions when it will be necessary for you to speak out, with the authority given to you at your ordination. At the same time, do not forget that the charismatic gift will die if it be neglected. Give yourself wholly to the cultivation of your character; so will you save yourself and those committed to your charge.

Ver. 11. **παράγγελλε**: In point of time, *teaching* precedes *commanding*. The tone of command can only be used in relation to fundamentals which have been accepted, but are in danger of being forgotten. Similar directions recur in v. 7 and vi. 3.

Ver. 12. **μηδείς—καταφρονείτω** ("*Libenter id faciunt senes inanes*," Ben-

o Gal. i. 13, γίνου τῶν πιστῶν ἐν λόγῳ, ἐν [o] ἀναστροφῇ, ἐν [p] ἀγάπῃ,[1] ἐν [p] πίστει, Eph. iv. 22, Heb. xiii. 7, Jas. iii. 13, 1 Pet. (6), 2 Pet. (2). ἐν [q] ἁγνίᾳ. 13. ἕως ἔρχομαι [r] πρόσεχε τῇ [s] ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ. 14. μὴ [t] ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ [u] χαρίσματος, ὃ

p See 1 Tim. i. 14. q 1 Tim. v. 2 only, N.T. r See 1 Tim. i. 4. s Acts xiii. 15, 2 Cor. iii. 14.
t Heb. ii. 3. u Rom. i. 11, xii. 6, 1 Cor. i. 7, vii. 7, xii. 4, 9, 28, 30, 31, 2 Tim. i. 6, 1 Pet. iv. 10.

[1] Add ἐν πνεύματι KLP. See 2 Cor. vi. 6.

gel). Many, probably, of the Ephesian presbyters were older than Timothy. For μηδείς in this position, *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 18, x. 24; Eph. v. 6; Col. ii. 18; Tit. ii. 15; Jas. i. 13. καταφρονέω connotes that the contempt felt in the mind is displayed in injurious action. (See Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vi., viii. 432). The meaning of this direction is qualified by the following ἀλλὰ τύπος γίνου, κ.τ.λ. It means, *Assert the dignity of your office even though men may think you young to hold it. Let no one push you aside as a boy.* Compare the corresponding direction Tit. ii. 15, μηδείς σου περιφρονείτω. On the other hand, St. Paul shows Timothy "a more excellent way" than self-assertion for the keeping up of his dignity: Give no one any ground by any fault of character for despising thy youth.

σου depends on τῆς νεότητος. Field supports this by an exact parallel from Diodorus Siculus. The two genitives do not, in strict grammar, depend on καταφρον., *despise thee for thy youth.*

τῆς νεότητος: St. Paul had met Timothy on the second missionary journey, dated by Harnack in A.D. 47, and by Lightfoot in A.D. 51. About the year 57, St. Paul says of Timothy, "Let no man despise him" (1 Cor. xvi. 11). 1 Tim. may be dated not more than a year before St. Paul's martyrdom, which Harnack fixes in A.D. 64, and Lightfoot in A.D. 67. The question arises, Could Timothy's νεότης have lasted all that time, about fifteen or sixteen years? We must remember that we have no information about Timothy's age when he joined St. Paul's company. But if he had been then fifteen or sixteen, or even seventeen, νεότης here need cause no difficulty. Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, Part II. vol. i. p. 448) adduces evidence from Polybius and Galen to show that a man might be called νέος up to the age of thirty-four or thirty-five. In any case, the terms "young" and "old" are used relatively to the average age at which men attain to positions in the world. Forty is reckoned old for a captain in the army, young for a bishop, very young for a Prime Minister. In an instructive parallel passage, Ignatius commends the Magnesians (§ 3) and their presbyters for not presuming upon the youth of their bishop. For Timothy's comparative youth, *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 22, τὰς δὲ νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας φεῦγε.

τύπος γίνου: For the sentiment, compare reff. and 1 Cor. iv. 16, Phil. iv. 9.

τύπος is followed by the genitive of the person for whose edification the τύπος exists in 1 Cor. x. 6, 1 Pet. v. 3.

In the following enumeration, λόγος is coupled with ἀναστροφή as *words* with *deeds* (Rom. xv. 18; Col. iii. 17). These refer to Timothy's public life; while *love*, *faith* and *purity* refer to his private life, in reference to which they are found in conjunction in ii. 15.

Ver. 13. ἕως ἔρχομαι: For ἕως with present indic, instead of fut. see Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 370. *Cf.* Luke xix. 13, John xxi. 22, 23.

ἀνάγνωσις, παράκλησις, διδασκαλία are the three elements in the ministry of the word: (*a*) *reading aloud* of Scripture (Luke iv. 16; Acts xiii. 15; 2 Cor. iii. 14, see Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., v. 262); (*b*) *exhortation* based on the reading, and appealing to the moral sense (2 Tim. iv. 2; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 67); (*c*) *teaching*, appealing to the intellect, see note on chap. i. 10. Exhortation and teaching are similarly joined in Rom. xii. 7, 8, and 1 Tim. vi. 2.

Ver. 14. μὴ ἀμέλει: J. H. Moulton (*Grammar*, vol. i. p. 122 *sqq.*), distinguishes (*a*) μή with the pres. imperat, "Do not go on doing so and so," *e.g.*, 1 Tim. v. 22, 23, from (*b*) μή with the aor. subjunctive, "Do not begin to do it" (1 Tim. v. 1; 2 Tim. i. 8). In this case, μὴ ἀμέλει is equivalent to πάντοτε μελέτα. Timothy's χάρισμα lay in his commission to rule and in his powers as a preacher. The χάρισμα was given by God; in this particular case the formal and solemn assumption of its use was accompanied by the indication of prophecy addressed to the ear, and by the

ἐδόθη σοι διὰ προφητείας μετὰ [v] ἐπιθέσεως [v] τῶν [v] χειρῶν τοῦ [w] πρεσβυτερίου. 15. ταῦτα [x] μελέτα, ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι, ἵνα σου ἡ [y] προκοπὴ [z] φανερὰ [z] ᾖ[1] πᾶσιν. 16. [a] ἔπεχε σεαυτῷ καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ· [b] ἐπίμενε αὐτοῖς· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν καὶ σεαυτὸν σώσεις καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντάς σου.

V. 1. Πρεσβυτέρῳ μὴ [a] ἐπιπλήξῃς, ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα,

v Acts viii. 18, 2 Tim. i. 6, Heb. vi. 2.
w Here only in this sense.
x Acts iv. 25 (Ps. ii. 1).
y Phil. i. 12, 25.
z Rom. i. 19, Gal. v. 19, 1 John iii. 10. Col. i. 23.
a Luke xiv. 7, Acts iii. 5, xix. 22.
b Acts xiii. 43 (T.R.), Rom. vi. 1, xi. 22, 23,
a Here only, not LXX.

[1] Ins. ἐν DcKLP.

laying on of hands addressed to the eye. See Acts xiii. 1-3.

Winer-Moulton notes, p. 471, that the *instrument*, as such, is never expressed by **μετά** in good prose. Here, *with, amid imposition of hands* (conjointly with the act of imposition). **μετά** is here equivalent to **διά** in the sense given above, *i.e.*, of accompanying circumstances.

2 Tim. i. 6 is usually reconciled with this passage by saying that the body of presbyters was associated with St. Paul in the laying on of hands. But there is no reason to suppose that the same transaction is referred to in both places. Here the charismata refer to preaching and teaching; but in 2 Tim., to the administrative duties committed to Timothy, as it is reasonable to suppose, by St. Paul alone, when he appointed him his representative. Note that **διά** is used of St. Paul's imposition of hands (2 Tim. i. 6), **μετά** of that of the presbyters, here. This suggests that it was the imposition of hands by St. Paul that was the instrument used by God in the communication of the charisma to Timothy.

πρεσβυτέριον: elsewhere in N.T. (Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5) means the Jewish Sanhedrin; but Ignatius uses the term, as here, to indicate the presbyters in a local Church (*Trall.* 7, 13; *Philadelph.* 7, etc.).

Ver. 15. **ταῦτα**: *i.e.*, reading, exhortation, teaching. **μελέτα**: *practise, exercise thyself in*, rather than *meditari*. So R.V., *Be diligent in*. (Bengel compares **γύμναζε** ver. 7.) *Cf.* Psal. i. 2, **ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ μελετήσει,** "In his law will he exercise himself," P.B.V., quoted by Prof. Scholefield.

ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι: To the parallels cited by Wetstein, **ἐν τούτοις ὁ Καῖσαρ . . . ἦν** (Plut. *Pomp.* p. 656 *b*), "Omnis in hoc sum" (Horace, *Epistles*, i. 1, 11) and Alford: "Totus in illis" (Horace, *Sat.* i. 9, 2), we may add **ἐν φόβῳ Κυρίου ἴσθι,** Prov. xxiii. 17. Timothy's progress manifest to all would secure his youth from being despised: *cf.* Matt. v. 16.

φανερὰ ᾖ: This expression is quite Pauline; see reff.; but St. Paul more frequently has **φανερὸς γενέσθαι,** 1 Cor. iii. 13, xi. 19, xiv. 25, Phil. i. 13.

Ver. 16. **ἔπεχε σεαυτῷ, κ.τ.λ.**: The teacher must needs prepare himself before he prepares his lesson. A similar thought is conveyed by the order of the words in Gen. iv. 4, "The Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering". **ἐπέχειν** (see reff. and Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 377) has a quite different signification in Phil. ii. 16. *Cf.* Acts xx. 28, **προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς.**

τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ: *Thy teaching* (R.V.). *The doctrine* (A.V.) can take care of itself. See note on i. 10. **αὐτοῖς** is neuter, referring to the same things as **ταῦτα**; not masc., "Remain with the Ephesians," as Grotius supposed, a view tolerated by Bengel.

σεαυτὸν σώσεις: *cf.* Ezek. xxxiii. 9.

CHAPTER V.—Vv. 1-16. The wise Church ruler must understand how to deal with his people individually. Each age and condition needs separate treatment: old men, young men; old women, young women. Widows in particular need discriminating care; since some of them may have to be supported by the Church; and we must not let the Church be imposed on, nor give occasion for scandal. Accordingly Church widows must be at least sixty years old, and be of good character.

Ver. 1. **πρεσβυτέρῳ** is best taken as a term of age, *seniorem* (Vulg.). This view is supported by the **ὡς πατέρα, πρεσβυτέρας, νεωτέρας.** The term **νεωτέρους** might possibly refer to a subordinate Church officer. In Acts v. 6 it is susceptible of that meaning; but in the subsequent narrative (Acts v. 10) **οἱ νεώτεροι** who are in attendance on the Apostles are merely **νεανίσκοι.**

b Here only, N.T. νεωτέρους ὡς ἀδελφούς, 2. [b]πρεσβυτέρας ὡς μητέρας, νεωτέρας ὡς
c See 1 Tim. iv. 12. ἀδελφὰς ἐν πάσῃ [c]ἁγνείᾳ. 3. Χήρας τίμα τὰς [d]ὄντως χήρας. 4.
d Mark xi. 32, 1 Tim. v. 5, 16, vi. 19. εἰ δέ τις χήρα τέκνα ἢ [e]ἔκγονα ἔχει, μανθανέτωσαν[1] πρῶτον τὸν
e Here only, N.T. ἴδιον οἶκον [f]εὐσεβεῖν καὶ [g]ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς [h]προγόνοις·
f 4 Macc. (5), Sus. 64, Acts xvii. 23. g Here only, N.T., not LXX. h 2 Tim. i. 3 only, N.T. i 1 Tim. ii. 3. k See 1 Tim. ii. 3. l See ver. 3.
τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστιν[2] [i]ἀπόδεκτον [k]ἐνώπιον [k]τοῦ [k]Θεοῦ. 5. ἡ δὲ [l]ὄντως

[1] μανθανέτω two cursives, d, f, m^{82}, vg. (except am* = *discant*).

[2] Ins. καλὸν καὶ 37, many others, boh., go., arm. See chap. ii. 3.

ἐπιπλήξῃς: *Treat harshly*. The more usual **ἐπιτιμᾶν** occurs 2 Tim. iv. 2. **παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα**: Respect for age must temper the expression of reproof of an old man's misdemeanours. **νεωτέρους** and the following accusatives in ver. 2 are governed by some such verb as *treat, behave towards, deal with*, implied in **ἐπιπλήξῃς** and **παρακάλει**.

Ver. 2. **ἐν πάσῃ ἁγνίᾳ**: *with the strictest regard to purity*, or perhaps *propriety*. Christians, Athenagoras tells us (*Legat.* 32), considered other Christians, according to their age, as sons and daughters; brothers and sisters; fathers and mothers. Ellicott quotes Jerome's maxim, "Omnes puellas et virgines Christi aut aequaliter ignora aut aequaliter dilige" (Epist. 52, 5, p. 259). Compare *de Imitatione Christi*, i. 8, "Be not a friend to any one woman, but recommend all good women in general to God".

Ver. 3. **τίμα**: It is difficult to fix precisely the force of **τιμάω** in this connexion. On the one hand, the passage (vv. 3-8) is a part of the general directions as to Timothy's personal relations to his flock. *Respect, honour*, would, then, render the word adequately. On the other hand, vv. 4 and 8 show that the question of widows' maintenance, as a problem of Church finance, was in the apostle's mind; and he goes on, in ver. 9, to lay down regulations for the admission of widows to the number of those who were entered on the Church register for support. Perhaps *respect* was first in the writer's mind, while the term used, **τίμα**, easily lent itself to the expression of the notion of *support*, which immediately suggested itself. Similarly Chrys. (**τῆς τῶν ἀναγκαίων τροφῆς**), comparing ver. 17, where **τιμή** has the sense of *pay*, *cf.* Ecclus. xxxviii. 1, Matt. xv. 4-6, Acts xxviii. 10. *Honora beneficiis* is Bengel's comment.

τὰς ὄντως: Those who really deserve the name of widows are (1) those who have no younger relatives on whom they have a claim for support, (2) those who conform to certain moral and spiritual requirements detailed below.

Ver. 4. **ἔκγονα**: *offspring* ought to be the best rendering of this. It has a wider connotation than *children* and narrower than *descendants*.

μανθανέτωσαν: It ought not to be necessary to say that the subject of this verb is **τέκνα ἢ ἔκγονα**, only that Chrys. Theod. Vulg. and d agree in referring it to the class **χῆραι**. ('Requite them in their descendants, repay the debt through the children," Chrys.; "*Discat primum domum suam regere.*" See critical note.) Similarly Augustine says of his mother Monica, "Fuerat enim unius viri uxor, mutuam vicem parentibus reddiderat, domum suam pie tractaverat" (*Confessiones*, ix. 9). This can only be regarded as a curiosity in exegesis.

πρῶτον: The first duty of children is filial piety. **οἶκον**, which is usually correlative to parents rather than children, is used here "to mark the duty as an act of family feeling and family honour" (De Wette, quoted by Ell.).

εὐσεβεῖν (*domum pie tractare*, m^{82}) with a direct accusative is also found in reff. Ellicott supplies an appropriate illustration from Philo, *de Decalogo*, § 23, "where storks are similarly said **εὐσεβεῖν** and **γηροτροφεῖν**".

προγόνοις: When the term occurs again, 2 Tim. i. 3, it has its usual meaning *forefather*. It is usually applied to forbears that are dead. Here it means parents, grandparents, or great-grandparents that are living; and this use of it was probably suggested by **ἔκγονα**, a term of equally vague reference. Plato, *Laws*, xi. p. 932, is quoted for a similar application of the word to the living.

τοῦτο γάρ, κ.τ.λ.: Besides being enjoined in the O.T., our Lord taught the same duty, Mark vii. 16-13=Matt. xv. 4-6. See also Eph. vi. 1, 2.

Ver. 5. **ἤλπικεν ἐπί**: *hath her hope set on*. See on iv. 10, the analogy of

χήρα καὶ [m] μεμονωμένη [n] ἤλπικεν ἐπὶ[1] Θεὸν[2] καὶ [o] προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσιν καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας· 6. ἡ δὲ [p] σπαταλῶσα ζῶσα τέθνηκεν. 7. καὶ ταῦτα [q] παράγγελλε, ἵνα [r] ἀνεπίλημπτοι ὦσιν. 8. εἰ δέ τις [s] τῶν [s] ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα[3] [t] οἰκείων οὐ [u] προνοεῖ,[4] τὴν [v] πίστιν [v w] ἤρνηται καὶ ἔστιν ἀπίστου χείρων. 9. Χήρα [x] καταλεγέσθω μὴ ἔλαττον ἐτῶν ἑξήκοντα γεγονυῖα, ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς

m Here only, not LXX.
n See 1 Tim. iv. 10.
o Wisd. iii. 9, Acts xi. 23, xiii. 43.
p Ecclus. xxi. 15, Ezek. xvi. 49, Jas. v. 5.
q See 1 Tim. i 3. r See 1 Tim. iii. 2. s John i. 11, xiii. 1, Acts iv. 23. t Gal. vi. 10, Eph. ii. 19. u Rom. xii. 17, 2 Cor. viii. 21. v Rev. ii. 13. w 2 Tim. iii. 5, Tit. ii. 12, *cf.* also 2 Tim. ii. 12, 13, Tit. i. 16. x Here only, N.T.

[1] Ins. τὸν ℵ[c]ADKL ; om. τὸν ℵ*CFGP.
[2] So ℵ[c]ACKLP, d, e, f, m[25, 82, 110], vg. ; Κύριον ℵ*Dᵍʳ*.
[3] Ins. τῶν CD[bc]KLP.
[4] So ℵ[c]ACD[c]LP ; προνοεῖται ℵ*D*FGK, one cursive.

which favours the omission of the article here.

προσμένει: She is like Anna, **νηστείαις καὶ δεήσεσιν λατρεύουσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν** (Luke ii. 37). **προσκαρτερεῖν** is more usual in this connexion, *e.g.*, Rom. xii. 12, Col. iv. 2.

Ell. notes that Paul always has the order **νυκτ. καὶ ἡμ.** as here. Luke has also this order, with the acc., but **ἡμ. καὶ νυκτ.** with the gen. In Rev. the order is **ἡμ. καὶ νυκτός**.

Ver. 6. **σπαταλῶσα**: The modern term *fast*, in which the notion of prodigality and wastefulness is more prominent than that of sensual indulgence, exactly expresses the significance of this word. The R.V., *she that giveth herself to pleasure*, is stronger than the A.V. A somewhat darker force is given to it here by the associated verb in ver. 11, **καταστρηνιάσωσιν**. The Vulg. is felicitous, *Quae in deliciis est, vivens mortua est*. The expression is more terse than in Rev. iii. 1, "Thou hast a name that thou livest and thou art dead". *Cf.* Rom. vii. 10, 24, Eph. iv. 18. Wetstein quotes in illustration from Stobaeus (238), as descriptive of a poor man's life of anxiety, **πένης ἀποθανὼν φροντίδων ἀπηλλάγη, ζῶν γὰρ τέθνηκε.**

Ver. 7. **ταῦτα** is best referred to ver. 4, with its implied injunctions to the younger generation to support their widows.

ἀνεπίλημπτοι: *i.e.*, all Christians whom it concerns, not widows only.

Ver. 8. The Christian faith includes the law of love. The moral teaching of Christianity recognises the divine origin of all natural and innocent human affections. The unbeliever, *i.e.*, the born heathen, possesses natural family affection; and though these feelings may be stunted by savagery, the heathen are not likely to be sophisticated by human perversions of religion, such as those denounced by Jesus in Mark vii. Ell. says. "It is worthy of notice that the Essenes were not permitted to give relief to their relatives without leave from their **ἐπίτροποι**, though they might freely do so to others in need; see Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 6."

The Christian who falls below the best heathen standard of family affection is the more blameworthy, since he has, what the heathen has not, the supreme example of love in Jesus Christ. We may add that Jesus Himself gave an example of providing for one's own, when He provided a home for His mother with the beloved disciple.

οἱ ἴδιοι are near relatives: **οἱ οἰκεῖοι**, members of one's household. One of the most subtle temptations of the Devil is his suggestion that we can best comply with the demands of duty in some place far away from our home. Jesus always says, Do the next thing; "Begin from Jerusalem", The path of duty begins from within our own house, and we must walk it on our own feet.

οἰκείων: The omission of the article in the true text before **οἰκείων** precludes the possibility of taking the word here in the allegorical sense in which it is used in Gal. and Eph.: "the household of the faith"; "the household of God".

προνοεῖ: This verb is only found elsewhere in N.T. in the phrase **προνοεῖσθαι καλά**, Rom. xii. 17, 2 Cor. viii. 21 (from Prov. iii. 4, **προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων**).

Ver. 9. **καταλεγέσθω**: St. Paul passes naturally from remarks about the duty of

y Acts vi. 3, γυνή, 10. [y] ἐν [z] ἔργοις [z] καλοῖς [y] μαρτυρουμένη, εἰ [a] ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν,
x. 22, xxii.
12. Heb. εἰ [b] ἐξενοδόχησεν, εἰ ἁγίων πόδας ἔνιψεν, εἰ [c] θλιβομένοις [d] ἐπήρκεσεν,
xi. 2, 39.

z See 1 Tim.
iii. 1.

a Here only, not LXX.
iii. 4, 2 Thess. i. 6, 7, Heb. xi. 37.

b Here only, not LXX.

c 2 Cor. i. 6, iv. 8, vii. 5, 1 Thess.

d 1 Macc. (2), ver. 16 only.

Church members to their widowed relatives to specific rules about the admission of widows to the roll of Church widows (see Acts vi. 1). The **χήρα** of this ver. is **ἡ ὄντως χήρα** of vv. 3 and 5, who was to receive consideration and official recognition. These widows had no doubt a ministry to fulfil—a ministry of love, prayer, intercession, and giving of thanks (Polycarp, 4); but it is difficult to suppose that St. Paul, or any other practically minded administrator, would contemplate a presbyteral order of widows, the members of which would enter on their duties at the age of 60, an age relatively more advanced in the East and in the first century than in the West and in our own time. We may add that the general topic of widows' maintenance is resumed and concluded in ver. 16.

In the references to widows in the earliest Christian literature outside the N.T. (with the exception of Ignatius *Smyrn.* 13) they are mentioned as objects of charity along with orphans, etc. (Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 6, *Polyc.* 4; Polycarp, 4; Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4, *Mand.* viii., *Sim.* i. v. 3, ix. 26, 27; Justin, *Apol.* i. 67). None of these places hints at an order of widows. The subject cannot be further discussed here; but the evidence seems to point to the conclusion that the later institution of widows as an order with official duties was suggested by this passage. The history of Christianity affords other examples of supposed revivals of apostolic institutions.

Ell., who follows Grotius in seeing in this verse regulations respecting an ecclesiastical or presbyteral widow, objects to the view taken above that it is "highly improbable that when criteria had been given, ver. 4 *sq.*, fresh should be added, and those of so very *exclusive* a nature: would the Church thus limit her alms?"

But ver. 4 *sq.* does not give the criteria, or qualifications of an official widow; but only describes the dominant characteristic of the life of the "widow indeed," *viz.*, devotion; and again, the Church of every age, the apostolic not less than any other, has financial problems to deal with. Charity may be indiscriminating, but there are only a limited number of widows for whose whole support the Church can make itself responsible; and this is why the limit of age is here so high. At a much younger age than 60 a woman would cease to have any temptation to marry again.

Lightfoot has important notes on the subject in his commentary on Ignatius, *Smyrn.* §§ 6, 13 (*Apost. Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. pp. 304, 322). See also, on the deaconess widow, Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, trans. vol. i. p. 122. The opinion of Schleiermacher that deaconesses are referred to here is refuted (1) by the provision of age, and (2) by the fact that they have been dealt with before, iii. 11.

According to Bengel, the gen. **ἐτῶν** depends on **χήρα, μὴ ἔλαττον** being an adverb, "of 60 years, not less".

γεγονῖα: It is best to connect this with the preceding words, as in Luke ii. 42, **καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα.** In favour of this connexion is the consideration that in the parallel, iii. 2, **μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα** stands alone, and that if **γεγονῖα** were to be joined with what follows, it would most naturally follow **γυνή.** As a matter of fact, this transposition is found in P.; and this connexion is suggested in D, two cursives, d, f, g, m[141], Vulg. (*quae fuerit* (g *fuerat*) *unius viri uxor*) go, boh, syrr, Theodore Mops., Theodoret, and Origen.

ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή: The Church widows must conform to the same ideal of the married life as the episcopi. See Tert. *ad uxorem*, i. 7, "Quantum fidei detrahant, quantum obstrepant sanctitati nuptiae secundae, disciplina ecclesiae et praescriptio apostoli declarat, cum digamos non sinit praesidere, cum viduam allegi in ordinem [*al.* ordinationem], nisi univiram, non concedit."

Ver. 10. **ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη**: **ἐν** with **μαρτυρεῖσθαι** means *in respect of.* See reff. and Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii., 562.

It is characteristic of the sanity of apostolic Christianity that as typical examples of "good works," St. Paul instances the discharge of commonplace duties, "the daily round, the common task". For **ἔργα καλά** see on chap. iii. 1.

εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν: As has been just

εἰ παντὶ [e] ἔργῳ [e] ἀγαθῷ [f] ἐπηκολούθησεν. 11. νεωτέρας δὲ χήρας [g] παραιτοῦ· ὅταν γὰρ [h] καταστρηνιάσωσιν[1] τοῦ Χριστοῦ, γαμεῖν

e See 1 Tim. ii. 10.
f Josh. xiv. 14.
g See 1 Tim. iv. 7.
h Here only, not LXX.

[1] So ℵCDKL; καταστρηνιάσουσιν AFGP, 31.

explained, the εἰ is not so much dependent on καταλεγέσθω as explanatory of ἐν ἔργοις καλ. μαρτ. The rendering of the Vulg., d, f, g, Amb., *filios educavit*, is better than that of m[141], *nutrivit*, or Ambrst. *enutrivit*. It is not child-birth so much as the "Christianly and virtuously bringing up of children," her own or those entrusted to her charge, that St. Paul has in his mind. Tert. *de Virg. vel.* 9, alluding to this passage, says, "Non tantum univirae, id est nuptae, aliquando eliguntur, sed et matres et quidem educatrices filiorum, scilicet ut experimentis omnium affectuum structae facile norint ceteras et consilio et solatio iuvare, etiut nihilominus ea decucurrerint, per quae femina probari potest". The later Church widows, among other duties, had the care of the Church orphans (*cf*, Hermas *Mand.* viii.; Lucian, *de morte Peregrini*, 12).

ἐξενοδόχησεν: Hospitality is a virtue especially demanded in a condition of society in which there is much going to and fro, and no satisfactory hotel accommodation. The episcopus must be φιλόξενος (iii. 2, where see note).

εἰ ἁγίων πόδας ἔνιψεν: If the strangers were also "saints," members of the Christian Society, they would naturally receive special attention. The mistress of the house would act as servant of the servants of God (*cf.* Gen. xviii. 6; 1 Sam. xxv. 41). Unless we assume the unhistorical character of St. John's Gospel, it is natural to suppose that the story told in John xiii. 5-14, and the Master's command to do as He had done, was known to St. Paul and Timothy. The absence of an article before πόδας "is due to assimilation to ἁγίων" (Blass, *Grammar*, p. 151, note 2).

εἰ παντὶ—ἐπηκολούθησεν cuts short any further enumeration of details, *if in short, she has devoted herself to good works of every kind.* There is an exact parallel to this use of ἐπακολουθέω in Josh. xiv. 14, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν [Caleb] ἐπακολουθῆσαι τῷ προστάγματι Κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ. The word also means to "check" or "verify" an account. In Mark xvi. 20, "the signs 'endorse' the word" (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 376). So here it may connote sympathy with, and interest in, good works, without actual personal labour in them.

Ver. 11. There are two main factors in the interpretation of this verse: (1) a general Church regulation—not laid down by St. Paul but found in existence by him—that a widow in receipt of relief should be ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή; and (2) his determination to make provision that no scandal should arise from broken vows. The notion was that there was a marriage tie between Christ and the Church widow. This would be *her first faith, her earliest and still valid plighted troth. Cf.* Rev. ii. 4, τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώτην ἀφῆκες (of the Church at Ephesus).

νεωτέρας may be rendered positively, *young.*

παραιτοῦ: *reject.* This verb is used of "profane and old wives' fables" (iv. 7), of "foolish and ignorant questionings" (2 Tim. ii. 23), of "a man that is heretical" (Tit. iii. 10); so that, at first sight, it seems a harsh term to use in reference to "young widows". But the harshness is explained when we remember that St. Paul is speaking, not of the widows in themselves, but as applicants for admission to the roll of specially privileged Church widows. In a Church still immature as to its organisation and *morale* the authorities would be only courting disaster were they to assume the control of young widows, a class whose condition gave them independence in the heathen society around them.

καταστρηνιάσωσιν: *Cum enim luxuriatae fuerint* [*in deliciis egerint*, m[110]] *in Christo* (Vulg.).

The word denotes the particular character of their restiveness. It was understood with this sexual reference in Pseud. Ignat. *ad Antioch.* 11, αἱ χῆραι μὴ σπαταλάτωσαν, ἵνα μὴ καταστρηνιάσωσι τοῦ λόγου. στρῆνος (over-strength), *wantonness* or *luxury* occurs Rev. xviii. 3; στρηνιάω, Rev. xviii. 7, 9, to *wax wanton, live wantonly*, or *luxuriously*. The preposition κατά, with the genitive, has the sense *against*, of opposition, as in καταβραβεύω, καταγελάω, καταδικάζω, κατακαυχάομαι, κατακρίνω, etc.

Mark vii. 9, Luke vii. 30, Gal. ii. 21, iii. 15, Heb. x. 28.

θέλουσιν, 12. ἔχουσαι κρίμα ὅτι τὴν πρώτην πίστιν [1] ἠθέτησαν. 13. [k] ἅμα [k] δὲ [k] καὶ [l] ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσιν, [m] περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας, οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀργαὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ [n] φλύαροι καὶ [o] περίεργοι, λαλοῦσαι [p] τὰ

k Acts xxiv. 26, Col. iv. 3, Philem. 22. l Matt. xii. 36, xx. 3, 6, Tit. i. 12, Jas. ii. 20, 2 Pet. i. 8. m Acts xix. 13, Heb. xi. 37. n Here only, N.T.; see note. o Not LXX; see note. p Tit. i. 11.

For ὅταν with the subjunctive or indicative, see Winer Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 388. The subjunctive, as in the text, is the normally correct way of expressing a contemplated contingency.

τοῦ Χριστοῦ: Here only in the Pastorals.

γαμεῖν θέλουσι: θέλειν has here an emphatic sense, as in John vii. 17; and its association here supports the view that it "designates the will which prodeeds from inclination," as contrasted with βούλομαι, "the will which follows deliberation" (Thayer's Grimm, *s.v.*). γαμεῖν is used of the woman also, ver. 14, Mark x. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 28, 34.

Ver. 12. ἔχουσαι κρίμα: *deserving censure.* There is no special force in ἔχουσαι, as Ell. explains, "bearing about with them a judgment, *viz.*, that they broke their first faith". This seems forced and unnatural. ἔχειν κρίμα is correlative to λαμβάνεσθαι κρίμα (Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47; Rom. xiii. 2; Jas. iii. 1). They *have condemnation because, etc.*, *habentes damnationem quia* (Vulg. m). κρίμα of course by itself means *judgment;* but where the context, as here, implies that the judgment is a sentence of guiltiness, it is reasonable so to translate it.

τὴν πρώτην πίστιν: This has been already explained. On the use of πρῶτος for πρότερος see Blass, *Gram.* p. 34.

ἠθέτησαν: *annulled, irritam fecerunt* (Vulg. m).

Ver. 13. ἅμα δὲ καί is Pauline. See reff.

It is best to assume an omission of εἶναι, not necessarily through corruption of the text, as Blass supposes (*Gram.* p. 247). On the example cited by Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 437 from Plato, *Euthyd.* p. 276 *b*, οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἄρα σοφοὶ μανθάνουσιν, and Dio. Chrys. lv. 558, Field notes, "Although the reading in Plato may be doubtful, there is no doubt of the agreement of St. Paul's construction with *later* usage". Field adds two from St. Chrysostom T. vii. p. 699 *a*: τί οὖν; ἂν παλαιστὴς μανθάνῃς; T. ix. p. 259 *b*: εἰ ἰατρὸς μέλλοις μανθάνειν. He notes that the correlative phraseology, διδάξαι (or διδάξασθαι) τινὰ τεκτόνα, χαλκέα, ἱππέα, ῥήτορα, is to be found in the best writers.

It is impossible to connect μανθ. περιερχ. as Vulg., *discunt circuire domos;* for, as Alf. says, "μανθάνω with a participle always means *to be aware of, take notice of*, the act implied in the verb". Here, *e.g.*, the meaning would be "they learn that they are going about," which is absurd. Bengel's view, that μανθάνουσι is to be taken absolutely, is equally impossible: "being idle, they are learners," the nature of the things they learn to be inferred from the way they spend their time. Von Soden connects μανθ. with τὰ μὴ δέοντα; suggesting that they learnt in the houses referred to in 2 Tim. iii. 6 what was taught there (ἃ μὴ δεῖ, Tit. i. 11).

περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας: These last words may possibly refer to the house to house visitation, *going about* (R.V.), which might be part of the necessary duty of the Church widows; but which would be a source of temptation to young women, and would degenerate into *wandering* (A.V.).

οὐ μόνον δὲ . . . ἀλλὰ καί is a Pauline use of constant occurrence. See Rom. v. 3, 11, viii. 23, ix. 10; 2 Cor. vii. 7, viii. 19; Phil. ii. 27 [οὐ . . . δὲ μόνον]; 2 Tim. iv. 8. Also in Acts xix. 27, 3 Macc. iii. 23.

ἀργαί, φλύαροι, περίεργοι: A series of natural causes and consequences. The social intercourse of idle people is naturally characterised by silly chatter which does not merely affect the understanding of those who indulge in it, but leads them on to mischievous interference in other people's affairs.

φλύαροι: φλυαρεῖν is found in 3 John 10, *prating.* φλύαρος is an epithet of φιλοσοφία in 4 Macc. v. 10; and in Prov. xxiii. 29 (ℵ[c]) φλυαρίαι ὁμιλίαι ἐνφιλόνικοι are among the consequences of excessive wine-drinking.

περίεργοι: See 2 Thess. iii. 11, μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους. In Acts xix. 19 τὰ περίεργα, *curious arts*, means the arts of those who are curious about, and pry into, matters concealed from human knowledge, *impertinent* to man's lawful needs.

[p] μὴ [p] δέοντα. 14. [q] βούλομαι οὖν νεωτέρας γαμεῖν, [r] τεκνογονεῖν, [s] οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, μηδεμίαν [t] [u] ἀφορμὴν [u] διδόναι τῷ [v] ἀντικειμένῳ [w] λοι- [r] δορίας [x] χάριν· 15. ἤδη γάρ τινες [y] ἐξετράπησαν [1] ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ. 16. εἴ τις [2] πιστὴ ἔχει χήρας [z] ἐπαρκείτω [3] αὐταῖς, καὶ μὴ [a] βαρείσθω ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἵνα ταῖς [b] ὄντως χήραις ἐπαρκέσῃ.

q See 1 Tim. ii. 8.
r Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 15.
s Here only, not LXX.
t Luke xi. 54, Rom. vii. 8, 11,

2 Cor. xi. 12, Gal. v. 13. u 2 Cor. v. 12. v 2 Thess. ii. 4, *cf.* Luke xiii. 17, xxi. 15, 1 Cor. xvi. 9, Phil. i. 28. w 1 Pet. iii. 9 only, N.T. x Luke vii. 47, Gal. iii. 19, Eph. iii. 1, 14, Tit. i. 5, 11, 1 John iii. 12, Jude 16. y See 1 Tim. i. 6. z See ver. 10. a See note. b See ver. 3.

[1] ἐξετράπ. τινες AFgrG, g.
[2] Ins. πιστὸς ἢ DKL, d, fuld., syrr.
[3] So CDKLP; ἐπαρκείσθω ℵA[FG], 17.

λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα expresses the positively mischievous activity of the **φλύαροι**, as **περίεργοι**. Compare Tit. i. 11, **διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ**. In both passages **μή** is expressive of the impropriety, in the writer's opinion, of whatever might conceivably be spoken and taught; whereas **τὰ οὐ δέοντα** would express the notion that certain specific improper things had, as a matter of fact, been spoken. See Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 603.

Ver. 14. **βούλομαι οὖν**: See note on 1 Tim. ii. 8.

νεωτέρας: The insertion of **χήρας** before **νεωτέρας** in about 30 cursives, Chrys. Theodoret, John Damasc., Jerome, is a correct gloss (so R.V.). The whole context deals with widows, not with women in general, as A.V. and von Soden.

γαμεῖν: There is nothing really inconsistent between this deliberate injunction that young widows should marry again, and the counsel in 1 Cor. vii. 8, that widows should remain unmarried. The widows here spoken of would come under the class of those who "have not continency"; not to mention that the whole world-position of the Church had altered considerably since St. Paul had written 1 Cor.

οἰκοδεσποτεῖν: well rendered in Vulg., *matres-familias esse*. The verb is only found here in the Greek Bible, but **οἰκοδεσπότης** frequently occurs in the Synoptists. It is the equivalent of **οἰκουργούς**, Tit. ii 5.

τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ: The singular (see ref.) does not refer to Satan, but is used generically for human adversaries. The plural is more usual, as in the other reff. *Cf.* **ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας**, Tit. ii. 8.

λοιδορίας χάριν is connected of course with **ἀφορμήν**, not with **βούλομαι**, as Mack suggests, "I will . . . on account of the reproach which might otherwise come on the Church".

For the sentiment *cf.* vi. 1, Tit. ii. 5, 8, 1 Peter ii. 12, iii. 16. In all these places the responsibility of guarding against scandal is laid on the members of the Church generally, not specially on the Church rulers. The construction of **χάριν** here is not quite the same as in Gal. iii. 19, Tit. i. 11, Jude 16. Here it is an appendage to the sentence, explanatory of **ἀφορμὴν διδόναι**.

Ver. 15. **τινες**: See note on i. 3.

ἐξετράπησαν ὀπίσω τοῦ Σ.: This is a pregnant phrase, meaning *They have turned out of the way* [*of life and light*] *and have followed after Satan*". "The prepositional use of **ὀπίσω**, which is foreign to profane writers, takes its origin from the LXX (Hebr. אַחֲרֵי)" (Blass, *Gram.* p. 129). The primary phrase is **ἔρχεσθαι** [also **ἀκολουθεῖν** or **πορεύεσθαι**] **ὀπίσω τινός**. For **ὀπίσω** in an unfavourable sense *cf.* Luke xxi. 8, John xii. 19, Acts v. 37, xx. 30, 2 Peter ii. 10, Jude 7, Rev. xiii. 3. The phrase, no doubt, refers to something worse than a second marriage.

Ver. 16. **εἴ τις πιστή**: This is one of those difficulties that prove the *bona fide* character of the letter. We may explain it in either of two ways: (1) It not unfrequently happens that the language in which we express a general statement is unconsciously coloured by a particular instance of which we are thinking at the moment. St. Paul has some definite case in his mind, of a Christian woman who had a widow depending on her, of whose support she wishes the Church to relieve her, or (2) the verse may be an afterthought to avoid the possibility of the ruling given in vv. 4, 7, 8 being supposed to refer to men only. Von Soden explains it by the independent position

c See 1 Tim. iii. 4.
d Heb. iii. 3, x. 29.
e See note on 1 Tim. iv. 10.
f Rom. ix. 17, x. 11, *cf.* Mark xv. 28.

17. Οἱ [c]καλῶς [c]προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς [d]ἀξιούσθωσαν, μάλιστα οἱ [e]κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ· 18. [f]λέγει

of married women indicated in ver. 14 and Tit. ii. 5. The phrase **ἔχει χήρας** may be intended to include dependent widowed relatives, aunts or cousins, who could not be called **προγόνοι**.

βαρείσθω. Compare the use of **βάρος**, 1 Thess. ii. 6, **δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι**; of **ἐπιβαρέω**, 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8; **καταβαρέω**, 2 Cor. xii. 16; **ἀβαρής**, 2 Cor. xi. 9.

This verse proves that the **κατάλογος** of widows here in view was primarily at least for poor relief.

Vv. 17-25. What I have been saying about the support of widows reminds me of another question of Church finance: the payment of presbyters. Equity and scriptural principles suggest that they should be remunerated in proportion to their usefulness. You are the judge of the presbyters; in the discharge of this office be cautious in accusing, and bold in rebuking. I adjure you to be impartial. Do not absolve without deliberate consideration. A lax disciplinarian is partner in the guilt of those whom he encourages to sin. Keep yourself pure. I do not mean this in the ascetic sense; on the contrary, your continual delicacy demands a stimulant. But, to resume about your duties as a judge, you need not distress yourself by misgivings; you will find that your judgments about men, even when only instinctive, are generally correct.

Ver. 17. The natural and obvious meaning of the verse is that while all presbyters discharge administrative functions, well or indifferently, they are not all engaged in preaching and teaching. We distinguish then in this passage three grades of presbyters: (1) ordinary presbyters with a living wage; (2) efficient presbyters (**κοπιῶντες**, 1 Thess. v. 12); (3) presbyters who were also preachers and teachers. *Cf.* Cyprian (*Epist.* 29), *presbyteri doctores*. It must be added that Hort rejects the distinction between (2) and (3) (*Christian Ecclesia*, p. 196).

ὁ διδάσκων and **ὁ παρακαλῶν** were possessors of distinct and recognised charismata (Rom. xii. 7; 1 Cor. xii. 8, 28, 29, xiv. 6).

προεστῶτες: See note on 1 Tim. iii. 4.

διπλῆς τιμῆς: *Remuneration* is a better rendering of **τιμή** than *pay*, as less directly expressive of merely monetary reward. Liddon suggests the rendering *honorarium*. On the one hand, **διπλῆς** certainly warrants us in concluding that presbyters that ruled well were better paid than those that performed their duties perfunctorily. Bengel justifies the better pay given to those that "laboured in the word, etc.," on the ground that persons so fully occupied would have less time to earn their livelihood in secular occupations. On the other hand, we must not press the term *double* too strictly (*cf.* Rev. xviii. 6, **διπλώσατε τὰ διπλᾶ**). **πλείονος τιμῆς** (Theod.) is nearer the meaning than "double that of the widows, or of the deacons, or simply, liberal support" (Chrys.). The phrase is based, according to Grotius, on Deut. xxi. 17; in the division of an inheritance the first-born received two shares, *cf.* 2 Kings ii. 9. The custom of setting a double share of provisions before presbyters at the love feasts (*Constt. Ap.* ii. 28) must have been, as De Wette says, based on a misunderstanding of this passage.

ἀξιούσθωσαν implies that what they were deemed worthy of they received.

κοπιῶντες: There is no special stress to be laid on this, as though some preachers and teachers worked harder in the exercise of their gift than others.

λόγῳ: The omission of the article, characteristic of the Pastorals, obscures the reference here to the constant phrase *speak*, or *preach the word*, or *the word of God*.

διδασκαλίᾳ: See note on chap. i. 10.

Ver. 18. If this verse is read without critical prejudice, it implies that in the writer's judgment a quotation from Deut. xxv. 4 and the Saying, **ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ.** might be coordinated as **ἡ γραφή**; just as in Mark vii. 10, Acts i. 20, and Heb. i. 10, two O.T. quotations are coupled by a **καί**. For this formula of quotation, in addition to the reff., see John xix. 37; Rom. iv. 3, xi. 2; Gal. iv. 30; Jas. ii. 23, iv. 5.

The question then arises, Is **ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ.** a proverbial saying carelessly or mistakenly quoted by St. Paul as **ἡ γραφή**? or, Was St. Paul familiar with its presence in a written document, an early gospel, the subject of which was so sacred as to entitle it to be called **ἡ**

[f] γὰρ [f] ἡ [f] γραφή, Βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ [g] φιμώσεις [1] · καί, Ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης [g] *Cf.* Matt. xxii. 12, 34, Mark i. 25, iv. 39, Luke iv. 35, 1 Pet. ii. 15.
τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. 19. κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου [h] κατηγορίαν μὴ [i] παρα- [h] John xviii. 29, Tit. i. 6, not LXX. [i] Acts xxii. 18

[1] **οὐ φιμ. βοῦν ἀλο.** ACP, 17, 37, 80, five others, f, vg., boh., syrpesh, arm.

γραφή? The question has been prejudged by supposed necessary limitations as to the earliest possible date for a gospel; and many have thought it safest to adopt Stier's statement that **ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ.** was a common proverb made use of both by our Lord (Luke x. 7; Matt. x. 10), and by St. Paul. In that case, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that St. Paul forgot that it was not **ἡ γραφή**; for here it is not natural to take **ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ.**, as a supplementary or confirmatory statement by the writer in the words of a well-known proverb. The proverb, if it be such, is rather the second item in **ἡ γραφή**, just as in 2 Tim. ii. 19, the "seal" consists of (*a*) "The Lord knoweth them that are his," and (*b*) "Let every one that nameth," etc. Our Lord no doubt employed proverbs that were current in His time, *e.g.*, Luke iv. 23, John iv. 37. In both these cases He intimates that He is doing so; but He does not do so in Matt. x. 10, or Luke x. 7. Besides, while the variation here between Matt. (**τῆς τροφῆς**) and Luke (**τοῦ μισθοῦ**) is of the same degree as in other cases of varying reports of Sayings from Q common to Matthew and Luke, yet such variation in wording is not likely in the case of a well-known proverb. We may add that it is difficult to know to what ruling of Christ reference is made in 1 Cor. ix. 14 if it be not this Saying. Critical opinion has recently grown inclined to believe that much of the gospel material which underlies the Synoptists was put into writing before our Lord's earthly ministry closed. (See Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 172.) The only question, therefore, is not, Could St. Paul have read the Evangelic narrative? but, Could he have co-ordinated a gospel document with the written oracles of God, venerated by every Hebrew as having a sanctity all their own? The question cannot be considered apart from what we know to have been St. Paul's conception of the person of Jesus Christ. We may readily grant that it would be a surprising thing if St. Paul thought of the writings of any contemporary apostle as "Scripture," as 2 Pet. iii. 16 does; but since he believed that Christ was "the end of the Law" (Rom. x. 4), it would be surprising were he not to have esteemed His words to be at least as authoritative as the Law which He superseded.

The order in Deut. xxv. 4 is **οὐ φιμ. βοῦν ἀλο.** The same text is quoted, 1 Cor. ix. 9 in the form **οὐ κημώσεις βοῦν ἀλο.** (B*D*FG). St. Paul's treatment of the command, as pointing to an analogy in the life of human beings, does not need any defence. Our just repudiation of the spirit in which he asks in 1 Cor., "Is it for the oxen that God careth?" must not blind us to the large element of truth in his answer, "Yea, for our sake it was written".

Ver. 19. The mention of **καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι**, and of what was due to them, naturally suggests by contrast the consideration of unsatisfactory presbyters. Yet even these were to be protected against the possibility of arbitrary dismissal. They were to have a fair trial in accordance with the provisions of the Old Law, Deut. xix. 15 (see also Deut. xvii. 6, Num. xxxv. 30. This requirement of two or three witnesses is used allegorically in 2 Cor. xiii. 1. *Cf.* John viii. 17, Heb. x. 28.) It has been asked, Why should this, the ordinary rule, be mentioned at all? The solution is to be found in a consideration of the private, unofficial, character of the Christian Church when this epistle was written. The Church was altogether a voluntary society, unrecognised by the state. The crimes of which its governors could take cognisance were spiritual; or if they were such as were punishable by the ordinary state law, the Church was concerned only with the spiritual and moral aspect of them, that is to say, so far as they affected Church life. There were then no spiritual courts, in the later sense of the term. No Church officer could enforce any but spiritual punishments. In these circumstances, the observance of legal regulations would not be a matter of necessity. Indeed a superintendent who was jealous for the purity of the Church might feel himself justified in acting even on suspicion, when the question arose as to the dismissal of a presbyter.

ἐκτὸς εἰ μή: This phrase arises from a

k 1 Cor. xiv. 5, xv. 2.
l Acts xix. 19, xxvii. 35.
m 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1.
n See 1 Tim. ii. 3.
o 1 Pet. i. 1, ii. 6, 9, 2 John i. 13.
p Matt. xix. 20 (= Mark x. 20 = Luke xviii. 21), Luke xi. 28, John xii. 47, Acts vii. 53, xvi. 4, xxi. 24, Rom. ii. 26, Gal. vi. 13, 1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. i. 14.
q Phil. ii. 14, 1 Tim. ii. 8.

δέχου, [k] ἐκτὸς [k] εἰ [k] μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων.[1] 20. τοὺς[2] [l] ἁμαρτάνοντας [l] ἐνώπιον [l] πάντων ἔλεγχε, ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσιν. 21. [m] Διαμαρτύρομαι [n] ἐνώπιον [n] τοῦ [n] Θεοῦ καὶ[3] Χριστοῦ [m] Ἰησοῦ[4] καὶ τῶν [o] ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων, ἵνα ταῦτα [p] φυλάξῃς [q] χωρὶς

[1] Om. ἐκτὸς-μαρτύρων Latin MSS. known to Jerome, also apparently Cyp. and Ambrst.

[2] Ins. δὲ AD*, d, f, g, *autem* (not r), go.; ins. δὲ after ἁμαρτ. FG.

[3] Ins. Κυρίου DcKLP, go., syrr. [4] Ἰησ. Χριστ. DcFKLP, go., syrr., arm.

blend of εἰ μή and ἐκτὸς εἰ. Examples of its use are cited from Lucian. Alford notes that similar "pleonastic expressions such as χωρὶς εἰ, or εἰ μή, are found in later writers such as Plutarch, Dio Cassius, etc.". Deissmann cites an instructive example for its use in the Cilician Paul from an inscription of Mopsuestia in Cilicia of the Imperial period (*Bible Studies*, trans. p. 118). See reff.

ἐπὶ . . . μαρτύρων: This seems an abbreviation for ἐπὶ στόματος μαρτ. So R.V. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 1, Hebr. עַל־פִּי עֵד. It is a different use from ἐπὶ in the sense of *before* (a judge), Mark xiii. 9, Acts xxv. 9, 10. See Blass, *Gram.* p. 137.

Ver. 20. τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας: It cannot be certainly determined whether this refers to offending presbyters only or to sinners in general. In favour of the first alternative, is the consideration that it seems to be a suitable conclusion to ver. 19; and the vehemence of the adjuration in ver. 21 receives thus a justification. It demands greater moral courage to deal judicially with subordinate officials than with the rank and file of a society.

On the other hand, the sequence of thought in these concluding verses of the chapter is not formal and deliberate. Although it has been shown above that vv. 17-25 form one section, marked by one prominent topic, the relation of Timothy to presbyters, it cannot be maintained that the connexion is indisputably obvious; and the use of the present participle suggests that habitual sinners are under discussion. One is reluctant to suppose that such men would be found amongst the presbyters of the Church.

ἐνώπιον πάντων: At first sight this seems opposed to the directions given by our Lord, Matt. xviii. 15, "Shew him his fault between thee and him alone"; but the cases are quite different: Christ is there speaking of the mutual relations of one Christian with another, as brothers in the household of God; here St. Paul is giving directions to a father in God, a Christian ruler, as in 2 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. i. 13, ii. 15. Moreover, as Ell. points out, Christ is speaking of checking the beginning of a sinful state, St. Paul is speaking of persistent sinners.

ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ, κ.τ.λ.: *Cf.* Deut. xiii. 11.

Ver. 21. διαμαρτύρομαι: It is easy to see that St. Paul had not perfect confidence in the moral courage of Timothy. He interjects similar adjurations, vi. 13, 2 Tim. iv. 1. In 1 Thess. iv. 6 we can understand διεμαρτυράμεθα to mean that purity had been the subject of a strong adjuration addressed by the apostle to his converts.

τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων: The epithet *elect* has probably the same force as *holy* in our common phrase, *The holy angels*. Compare the remarkable parallel, cited by Otto and Krebs, from Josephus, *B. J.* ii. 16, 4, μαρτύρομαι δὲ ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμῶν τὰ ἅγια καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρίδα τὴν κοινήν, and *Testament of Levi*, xix. 3, μάρτυς ἐστι κύριος, κ. μάρτυρες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, κ. μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς. The references to angels in St. Paul's speeches and letters suggest that he had an unquestioning belief in their beneficent ministrations; though he may not have attached any importance to speculations as to their various grades. We are safe in saying that *the elect angels* are identical with "the angels which kept their own principality" (Jude 6), "that did not sin" (2 Pet. ii. 4).

Ellicott follows Bp. Bull in giving ἐνώπιον a future reference to the Day of Judgment, when the Lord will be at-

[r] προκρίματος, μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ [s] πρόσκλισιν.[1] 22. Χεῖρας [t] ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει, μηδὲ [u] κοινώνει ἁμαρτίαις [v] ἀλλοτρίαις· σεαυτὸν

r Here only, not LXX.
s Here only, not LXX.
t 2 Thess.

ii. 2. u 2 John 11. v Rom. xiv. 4, xv. 20, 2 Cor. x. 15, 16, Heb. ix. 25.

[1] So ℵFGK, 47**, 67**, many others, d, f, g, r, vg.; πρόσκλησιν ADLP, 17, 31, 37, 47*, 80, more than fifty-four others.

tended by "ten thousands of His holy ones" (Jude 14). But this seems an evasion due to modern prejudice. ἐνώπιον implies that the solemnity of the charge or adjuration is heightened by its being uttered in the actual presence of God, Christ, and the angels. Perhaps one may venture to suppose that these are thought of as in three varying degrees of remoteness from human beings, with our present powers of perception. God the Father, though indeed "He is not far from each one of us," "dwells in light unapproachable"; Christ Jesus, though in one sense He dwells in us and we in Him, is for the most part thought of as having His special presence at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens; but the angels, though spiritual beings, are akin to ourselves, creatures as we are, powers with whom we are in immediate and almost sensible contact, *media* perhaps through which the influences of the Holy Spirit are communicated to us.

ταῦτα refers to all the preceding disciplinary instructions.

προκρίματος: *dislike, praejudicium.*

πρόσκλισιν: *partiality* (*nihil faciens in aliam partem declinando*, Vulg.).

Clem. Rom., *ad Cor.* 21, has the phrase κατὰ προσκλίσεις. The reading πρόσκλησιν is almost certainly due to itacism. It could only mean "*by invitation, i.e.*, the invitation or summons of those who seek to draw you over to their side" (Thayer's Grimm).

Ver. 22. Our best guide to the meaning of χεῖρας . . . ἐπιτίθει is the context, and more especially the following clause, μηδὲ . . . ἀλλοτρίαις. μηδέ constantly introduces an extension or development of what has immediately preceded; it never begins a new topic. Now the injunction *Be not partaker of other men's sins* is certainly connected with the disciplinary rebuke of sin, and refers of course to definite acts of sin committed in the past, as well as to their consequences or continuation. The whole procedure is outlined: we have the accusation in ver. 19, the conviction and sentence in ver. 20, and—in the true Pauline spirit—repentance and reconciliation in this verse; and the topic of ministerial treatment of sin is resumed and continued in ver. 24 *sq.* We can hardly doubt that St. Paul had in his mind Lev. xix. 17, "Thou shalt surely rebuke thy neighbour and not bear sin because of him," καὶ οὐ λήμψῃ δι' αὐτὸν ἁμαρτίαν. To witness in silence an act of wrong-doing is to connive at it. If this is true in the case of private persons, how much more serious an offence is it in the case of those to whom government is committed? See 2 John 11, ὁ λέγων γὰρ αὐτῷ χαίρειν κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς.

χεῖρας . . . ἐπιτίθει is then best referred to imposition of hands on reconciled offenders, on their re-admission to Church communion. Eusebius (*H. E.*, vii. 2), speaking of reconciled heretics, says, "The ancient custom prevailed with regard to such that they should receive only the laying on of hands with prayers," μόνῃ χρῆσθαι τῇ διὰ χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως εὐχῇ. See Council of Nicea, can. 8, according to one explanation of χειροθετουμένους, and Council of Arles, can. 8.

This was used in the case of penitents generally. So Pope Stephen (ap. Cyprian, *Ep.* 74), "Si qui ergo a quacunque haeresi venient ad vos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illis imponatur in paenitentiam". See Bingham, *Antiquities*, xviii. 2, 1, where the 15th Canon of the Council of Agde (A.D. 506) is cited: "Poenitentes tempore quo poenitentiam petunt, impositionem manuum et cilicium super caput a sacerdote consequantur." The antiquity of the custom may be argued from the consideration that imposition of hands was so prominent a feature in ordination, that it is not likely that its use would have been extended to anything else if such extension could not have claimed unquestioned antiquity in its favour. If the explanation of this verse given above—which is that of Hammond, De Wette, Ellicott, and Hort—be accepted, we have here the first distinct allusion to the custom of receiving back penitents by imposition of hands.

[w] 2 Cor. xi. ἁγνὸν [w]τήρει. 23. μηκέτι [x]ὑδροπότει, ἀλλὰ οἴνῳ ὀλίγῳ [y]χρῶ διὰ 9, Jas. i. 27, *cf.* 1 τὸν [z]στόμαχον[1] καὶ τὰς [a]πυκνάς σου [b]ἀσθενείας. 24. τινῶν Tim. vi. 14, 2 Tim. ἀνθρώπων αἱ ἁμαρτίαι [c]πρόδηλοί εἰσιν, [d]προάγουσαι εἰς κρίσιν, iv. 7.

[x] Here only N.T., Dan. i. 12, LXX. [y] Here only (N.T.) of food. [z] Here only, not LXX. [a] Here only, N.T., as adj. [b] Matt. viii. 17, Luke v. 15, viii. 2, xiii. 11, 12, John v. 5, xi. 4, Acts xxviii. 9, 1 Cor. ii. 3, Gal. iv. 13. [c] Vv. 24, 25, Heb. vii. 14, Judith viii. 29, 2 Macc. iii. 17, xiv. 39. [d] 1 Tim. i. 18.

[1] Ins. σου DcFGKL, f, g, vg., go., sah., boh., syrr., arm.; om. σου ℵAD*P, 17, d, r.

Timothy is bidden to restrain by deliberate prudence the impulses of mere pity. A hasty reconciliation tempts the offender to suppose that his offence cannot have been so very serious after all; and smoothes the way to a repetition of the sin. "Good-natured easy men" cannot escape responsibility for the disastrous consequences of their lax administration of the law. They have a share in the sins of those whom they have encouraged to sin. Those who give letters of recommendation with too great facility fall under the apostolic condemnation.

On the other hand, the ancient commentators — Chrys., Theod., Theoph., Oecumen.—refer **χεῖρας ἐπιτίθει** to hasty ordinations; and in support of this, the generally adopted view, it must be granted that **ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν** undoubtedly refers to ordination in iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6. If we assume the same reference here, the intention of the warning would be that Timothy will best avoid clerical scandals by being cautious at the outset as to the character of those whom he ordains. The clause in iii. 10, **καὶ οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον**, would, in this case, have the same reference; and we should explain **ἁμαρτίαι ἀλλότριαι** as possible future sins, for the commission of which a man's advancement may give him facilities, and responsibility for which attaches, in various degrees of blameworthiness, to those who have rendered it possible for him to commit them.

σεαυτόν is emphatic, repeating in brief the warning of the previous clause.

ἁγνόν: The context demands that the meaning should not be *chaste* (*castum* Vulg.), as in Tit. ii. 5, 2 Cor. xi. 2; but *pure* in the sense of *upright, honourable*, as in 2 Cor. vii. 11, Phil. iv. 8, Jas. iii. 17.

Ver. 23. **μηκέτι ὑδροπότει**: An adequate explanation of this seemingly irrelevant direction is that since there is a certain degree of ambiguity in **ἁγνός**, St. Paul thought it necessary to guard against any possible misunderstanding of *Keep thyself pure*: "I do not mean you to practice a rigid asceticism; on the contrary, I think that you are likely to injure your health by your complete abstinence from wine; so, *be no longer a water-drinker*, etc." So Hort, who thinks that this is "not merely a sanitary but quite as much a moral precept" (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 144). This explanation is preferable to that of Paley who regards this as an example of "the negligence of real correspondence . . . when a man writes as he remembers: when he puts down an article that occurs the moment it occurs, lest he should afterwards forget it" (*Horae Paulinae*). Similarly Calvin suggested that **σεαυτὸν —ἀσθενείας** was a marginal note by St. Paul himself. Alford's view has not much to commend it, *viz.*, that Timothy's weakness of character was connected with his constant ill health, and that St. Paul hoped to brace his deputy's will by a tonic.

For this position of **μηκέτι** *cf.* Mark ix. 25, xi. 14, Luke viii. 49, John v. 14, viii. 11, Rom. xiv. 13, Eph. iv. 28; and see note on chap. iv. 14.

διὰ τὸ στόμαχον: Wetstein's happy quotation from Libanius, *Epist.* 1578 must not be omitted: **πέπτωκε καὶ ἡμῖν ὁ στόμαχος ταῖς συνεχέσιν ὑδροποσίαις.**

Ver. 24. The connexion of this general statement is especially with ver. 22. The solemn warning against the awful consequences of an ill-considered moral judgment on those condemned was calculated to overwhelm a weak man with anxiety. Here the apostle assures Timothy that in actual practical experience the moral diagnosis of men's characters is not so perplexing as might be supposed antecedently. The exegesis of **προάγουσαι** and **ἐπακολουθοῦσιν** depends on the view we take of **κρίσις**; *viz.*, whether it refers to a judgment passed by man in this world, or to the final doom pronounced by God in the next. **κρίσις** is used of such a judgment as man may pass, in John viii. 16, 2 Peter ii. 11, Jude 9; though the

τισὶν δὲ καὶ [e]ἐπακολουθοῦσιν· 25. [f]ὡσαύτως[1] καὶ τὰ [g]ἔργα [g]τὰ [g]καλὰ[2] [e]πρόδηλα,[3] καὶ τὰ [h]ἄλλως ἔχοντα κρυβῆναι οὐ δύνανται.[4]

e Mark xvi. 20, 1 Pet. ii. 21, *cf.* ver. 10.

VI. 1. Ὅσοι εἰσὶν [a]ὑπὸ [a]ζυγὸν δοῦλοι τοὺς ἰδίους [b]δεσπότας [f]πάσης τιμῆς ἀξίους [c]ἡγείσθωσαν, [d]ἵνα [d]μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ

f See 1 Tim ii. 9.

g See 1 Tim. iii. 1.

h Hereonly,

N.T. a Ecclus. li. 26, Zech. iii. 9, Jer. xxxiv. (xxvii.) 8, 11. b Luke ii. 29, 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2, 2 Tim. ii. 21, Tit. ii. 9, 1 Pet. ii. 18, 2 Pet. ii. 1. c See 1 Tim. i. 12. d Tit. ii. 5, Rom. ii. 24 (Isa. lii. 5).

[1] Ins. δὲ AFG, f, g, go. [2] τὰ καλὰ ἔργα KL.

[3] Add ἐστι KL; add εἰσὶ DFGP, 17, 67*, five others.

[4] So ADP, 17, 47, 67, more than thirty-five others; δύναται ℵFGKL.

word is more frequently used of the Great final Judgment. If, as is generally allowed, these verses, 24 and 25, are resumptive of ver. 22, the **κρίσις** here indicated is that of the Church ruler, Timothy in this case, deciding for or against the admission of men to communion (or to ordination). It is evident that the final Judgment of God, which no one can certainly forecast, cannot help or hinder a decision made in this life by one man about another. The meaning, then, of the clause is as follows: In the case of some men, you have no hesitation as to your verdict; their sins are notorious and force you to an adverse judgment. With regard to others, your suspicions, your instinctive feeling of moral disapproval, comes to be confirmed and justified by subsequent revelation of sins that had been concealed. This is, in the main, the explanation adopted by Alford.

πρόδηλοι: Not *open beforehand* (A.V.), but *evident* (R.V.), *manifesta sunt* (Vulg.) as in Heb. vii. 14 (neut.). The **προ** is not indicative of antecedence in time, but of publicity, as in **προεγράφη**, Gal. iii. 1.

προάγουσαι: It is best to take this in a transitive sense, as in Acts xii. 1, xvii. 5, xxv. 26, of bringing a prisoner forth to trial. Here the object of the verb is understood out of **τινῶν ἀνθρώπων**. The men are in the custody of their sins, which also testify against them. In the other case, the witnesses—the sins—do not appear until the persons on trial have had sentence pronounced on them. We supply **εἰς κρίσιν** after **ἐπακολουθοῦσιν**.

Ver. 25. **ὡσαύτως** here, as in chap. ii. 9, naturally introduces an antithesis to what has gone before; and this determines the meaning of **τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα**; not as **ἔργα** which are not **καλά**, but as **ἔργα καλά** which are not **πρόδηλα**; and justifies the R.V. rendering, *There are good works that are evident.* The next clause is parallel to the corresponding part of ver. 24: Sins and good works alike cannot be successfully and indefinitely concealed; they follow—are disclosed some time or other in justification of—the **κρίσις** of men. The literal rendering in R.V. m., *The works that are good are evident*, could only be defended by laying emphasis on **καλά**, "good in appearance as well as in reality"; but **καλὰ ἔργα** is of frequent occurrence in these epistles without any such special signification; see on iii. 1; and this rendering deprives **ὡσαύτως** of any force. Von Soden thinks that we have here a reference to the sayings in Matt. v. 14-16.

CHAPTER VI.—Vv. 1-2. The duty of Christian slaves to heathen and Christian masters respectively.

Ver. 1. The politico-social problem of the first ages of Christianity was the relation of freemen to slaves, just as the corresponding problem before the Church in our own day is the relation of the white to the coloured races. The grand truth of the brotherhood of man is the revolutionary fire which Christ came to cast upon earth. Fire, if it is to minister to civilisation, must be so controlled as to be directed. So with the social ethics of Christianity; the extent to which their logical consequences are pressed must be calculated by common sense. One of the great dangers to the interests of the Church in early times was the teaching of the gospel on liberty and equality, crude and unqualified by consideration of the other natural social conditions, also divinely ordered, which Christianity was called to leaven, not wholly to displace.

The slave problem also meets us in Eph. vi. 5, Col. iii. 22, Tit. ii. 9, Philem. 1 Pet. ii. 18. In each place it is dealt with consistently, practically, Christianly.

The difficulty in this verse is **ὑπὸ**

e Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 11, Wisd. xvi. 11, 24, 2 Macc. vi. 13, ix. 26, 4 Macc. viii. 17, Acts iv. 9. f 1 Macc. ii. 48, 2 Macc. xiv. 15, Luke i. 54, Acts xx. 35.

ὑπὸ ζυγόν. The contrast in ver. 2, οἱ δὲ πιστ. ἔχ. δεσπ. seems to prove that a δοῦλος ὑπὸ ζυγόν is one that belongs to a heathen master. The R.V. is consistent with this view, *Let as many as are servants under the yoke.* The heathen estimate of a slave differed in degree, not in kind, from their estimate of cattle; a Christian master could not regard his slaves as ὑπὸ ζυγόν.

τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότας: The force of ἴδιος was so much weakened in later Greek that it is doubtful if it amounts here to more than αὐτῶν. See on iii. 4.

δεσπότης is more strictly the correlative of δοῦλος than is κύριος, and is used in this sense in reff. except Luke ii. 29. St. Paul has κύριος in his other epistles (Rom. xiv. 4; Gal. iv. 1; Eph. vi. 5, 9; Col. iii. 22, iv. 1); but, as Wace acutely remarks, in all these passages there is a reference to the Divine κύριος which gives the term a special appropriateness.

πάσης τιμῆς ἀξίους, *worthy of the greatest respect.*

ἵνα μὴ—βλασφημῆται: The phrase "blaspheme the name of God" comes from Isa. lii. 5 (*cf.* Ezek. xxxvi. 20-23). See Rom. ii. 24, 2 Pet. ii. 2. See note on v. 14. The corresponding passage in Tit. ii. 10, ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ κοσμῶσιν, supports Alford's contention that the article here is equivalent to a possessive pronoun, *His doctrine.* On the other hand, the phrase does not need any explanation; *the doctrine* would be quite analogous to St. Paul's use elsewhere when speaking of the Christian faith. For διδασκαλία, see note on i. 10.

Ver. 2. A Christian slave would be more likely to presume on his newly acquired theory of liberty, equality and fraternity in relation to a Christian master than in relation to one that was a heathen. The position of a Christian master must have been a difficult one, distracted between the principles of a faith wbich he shared with his slave, and the laws of a social state which he felt were not wholly wrong. 1 Cor. vii. 22 and Philem. 16 illustrate the position.

μᾶλλον δουλευέτωσαν: *serve them all the more, magis serviant* (Vulg.).

For this use of μᾶλλον *cf.* Rom. xiv. 13, 1 Cor. v. 2, vi. 7, 9, Eph. iv. 28, v. 11. Ignat. *Polyc.* 4 says of Christian slaves, μηδὲ αὐτοὶ φυσιούσθωσαν, ἀλλ' εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πλέον δουλευέτωσαν.

ὅτι πιστοί, κ.τ.λ.: The Christian slave is to remember that the fact of his master being a Christian, *believing and beloved,* entitles him to service better, if possible, than that due to a heathen master. The slave is under a moral obligation to render faithful service to any master. If the spiritual status of the master be raised, it is reasonable that the quality of the service rendered be not lowered, but rather idealised. "*The benefit* is the improved quality of the service, and *they that partake of* or *enjoy it* are the masters" (Field *in loc.*). So Vulg., *qui beneficii participes sunt.*

εὐεργεσία has its usual non-religious signification, as in Acts iv. 9. It does not indicate the goodness of God in redemption, as suggested in A.V., influenced no doubt directly by Calvin and Beza, though the explanation is as old as Ambr., *because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit.* On the other hand, it is more natural to use εὐεργεσία of the kindness of an employer to a servant or employee, than of the advantage gained by the employer from his servant's good-will. Accordingly Chrysostom takes it here in the former sense, the whole clause referring to the slaves. Von Soden, taking εὐεργεσία similarly, renders, *as those who occupy themselves in doing good.* No doubt the best reward of faithful service is the acquisition of a character of trustworthiness and the grateful love of the master to whom you are invaluable; but it is rather far-fetched to read this subtle meaning into the passage before us. In support of the view taken above, Alford quotes from Seneca, *De Beneficiis,* iii. 18, a discussion of the query, "An beneficium dare servus domino possit?" which Seneca answers in the affirmative, adding further: "Quidquid est quod servilis officii formulam excedit, quod non ex imperio sed ex voluntate praestatur, beneficium est". See Lightfoot, *Philippians,* 270 *sqq.*, *St. Paul and Seneca.*

ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι: ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι properly means *to lay hold of,* hence

Ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει. 3. εἴ τις [g] ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ [h] προσέρχεται [1] [i] ὑγιαίνουσι [i] λόγοις, τοῖς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ [k] τῇ [k] κατ' [k] εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ, 4. [m] τετύφωται, μηδὲν [n] ἐπιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ [o] νοσῶν περὶ [p] ζητήσεις καὶ [q] λογομαχίας,

g See 1 Tim. i. 3.
h See note.
i 2 Tim. i. 13, see 1 Tim. i. 10.
k Tit. i. 1.
l See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
m See 1 Tim. iii. 6.
n Mark xiv. 68, Acts (9), Heb. xi. 8, Jas. iv. 14, Jude 10.
o Wisd. xvii. 8 (*bis*) only.
p John iii. 25, Acts xv. 2, 7, xxv. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 9, not LXX.
q Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 14.

[1] προσέχεται ℵ*. So Bentley conj. from Latin *adquiescit*.

to help, as in reff.; and the Harclean Syriac gives that sense here. Like our English word *apprehend*, it passes from an association with the sense of touch to an association with the other senses or faculties which connect us with things about us. Field (*in loc.*) gives examples of the use of **ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι** as expressive of a person being *sensible* of anything which acts upon the senses, *e.g.*, the smell of a rose. The Peshitta agrees with this. Alford renders *mutually receive*, by which he seems to intend the same thing as Ell., who suggests that **ἀντί** has "a formal reference to the *reciprocal* relation between master and servant". Field rejects this because "receive in exchange" is **ἀντιλαμβάνειν**, and the examples cited by Alf. are middle only in form.

δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει: See note on iv. 13.

Vv. 3-21. Thoughts about the right use of wealth are suggested by the slave problem, a mischievous attitude towards which is associated with false doctrine. If a man possesses himself, he has enough. This possession is eternal as well as temporal. This is my lesson for the poor, for you as a man of God (and I solemnly adjure you to learn and teach it), and for the rich.

Ver. 3. **ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ**: See note on i. 3.

καὶ μὴ: Blass (*Gramm.* p. 514) notes this case of **μή** following **εἰ** with the indicative (supposed reality) as an abnormal conformity to classical use. The usual N.T. use, **εἰ . . . οὐ**, appears in 1 Tim. iii. 5, v. 8. In these examples, however, the **οὐ** is in the same clause as **εἰ**, not separated from it, as here, by a **καί**.

προσέρχεται: *assents to.* The noun **προσήλυτος**, proselyte, "one who has come over," might alone render this use of **προσέρχομαι** defensible. But Ell. gives examples of this verb from Irenæus and Philo; and Alf. from Origen, which completely justify it. The reading **προσέχεται**, which seems to derive support from the use of **προσέχειν**, i. 4, Tit. i. 14, has not exactly the same force; "to give heed," or "attend to," a doctrine falls short of giving in one's adhesion to it.

ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις: See on i. 10.

τοῖς τοῦ Κυρίου: This is in harmony with St. Paul's teaching elsewhere, that the words spoken through the prophets of the Lord are the Lord's own words. It is thus we are to understand Acts xvi. 7, "The Spirit of Jesus suffered them not," and 1 Cor. xi. 23, "I received of the Lord," etc. The words of Jesus, "He that heareth you heareth me" (Luke x. 16) have a wider reference than was seen at first.

τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ: See ref. and notes on i. 10, ii. 2.

Ver. 4. **τετύφωται**: *inflatus est* (d, m^{50}, r); *superbus est* (Vulg.). See on iii. 6.

νοσῶν: *morbidly busy* (Liddon), *languens* (Vulg.), *aegrotans* (m^{50}). His disease is intellectual curiosity about trifles. Both *doting* and *mad after* (Alf.) as translations of **νοσῶν**, err by excess of vigour. The idea is a simple one of *sickness* as opposed to health. See on i. 10.

περὶ: For this use of **περί** see on i. 19.

ζητήσεις: See on i. 4.

λογομαχίας: It is not clear whether what is meant are *wordy quarrels* or *quarrels about words.* The latter seems the more likely. There is here the usual antithesis of words to deeds. The heretic spoken of is a theorist merely; he wastes time in academic disputes; he does not take account of things as they actually are. On the other hand, it is interesting and suggestive that to the heathen, the controversy between Christianity and Judaism seemed to be of this futile nature (see Acts xviii. 15, xxiii. 29, xxv. 19).

φθόνος, ἔρις are similarly juxtaposed Rom. i. 29, Gal. v. 20, 21, Phil. i. 15.

The plural **ἔρεις** is a well-supported variant in Rom. xiii. 13, Gal. v. 20. In Tit. iii. 9 it is the true reading; but in other lists of vices (1 Cor. iii. 3,

r Here only, ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις,[1] βλασφημίαι, [r]ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί, 5.
N.T.
s Here only, [s]διαπαρατριβαὶ[2] [t]διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν καὶ [u]ἀπεστερη-
not LXX.
t Here only μένων τῆς ἀληθείας, [v]νομιζόντων [w]πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν [1]εὐσέβειαν.[3]
metaph.,
cf. Luke 6. Ἔστιν δὲ [x]πορισμὸς μέγας ἡ [y]εὐσέβεια μετὰ [z]αὐταρκείας· 7.
xii. 33, 2
Cor. iv.
16, Rev. viii. 9, xi. 18. u Mark x. 19, 1 Cor. vi. 7, 8, vii. 5, Jas. v. 4 (?). v Matt. (3), Luke
(2), Acts (7), 1 Cor. vii. 26, 36. w Wisd. xiii. 19, xiv. 2 only; verb, Wisd. xv. 12 only. x See
ver. 5. y See 1 Tim. ii. 2. z 2 Cor. ix. 8, *cf.* Phil. iv. 11.

[1] So ℵAK[sil]P, 17, many others, syr[pesh], sah., boh., arm.; ἔρεις DFGL, 47, some others, d, f, g, m[50], r, vg., go., syr[hcl].

[2] παραδιατριβαὶ a few cursives.

[3] Add ἀφίστασο ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων Dgr [c]KLP, m[50], *Discede ab eiusmodi*, syrr., arm.

2 Cor. xii. 20, Phil. i. 15) the singular is found.

βλασφημία also occurs in a list of sins, Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8.

ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί: **ὑπόνοια** (only here in N.T., but **ὑπονοέω** in Acts xiii. 25, xxv. 18, xxvii. 27, all in neutral sense, *to suppose*) has sometimes the sense of *suspicion*. See examples given by Ell. The phrase here does not mean wicked or unworthy thoughts of God—the class of mind here spoken of does not usually think about God directly, though an unworthy opinion about Him underlies their life—but *malicious suspicions* as to the honesty of those who differ from them.

Ver. 5. **διαπαρατριβαί**: The force of the **διά** is expressed in the R.V., *wranglings*, which denotes *protracted* quarrellings, *perconfricationes* (r), *conflictationes* (d, Vulg.). Field (*in loc.*) comparing **διαμάχεσθαι, διαφιλοτιμεῖσθαι,** etc., prefers the sense of *reciprocity, mutual irritations, gallings one of another* (A.V.m.), "as infected sheep by contact communicate disease to the sound" (Chrys.). **παραδιατριβαί** (T.R.), *perverse disputings*, is given a milder sense by Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 126, "misplaced diligence or useless disputing".

διεφθαρμένων τὸν νοῦν: *cf.* **κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν**, 2 Tim. iii. 8, the acc. being that of the remoter object. *Cf.*, for the notion, **τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης**, Eph. iv. 22, also 1 Cor. xv. 33, 2 Cor. xi. 3, Jude 10.

ἀπεστερημένων: *privati*. **ἀποστερέω** conveys the notion of a person being deprived of a thing to which he has a right. See reff. This is expressed in R.V., *bereft of*. The truth was once theirs; they have disinherited themselves. The A.V., *destitute of*, does not assume that they ever had it.

νομιζόντων, κ.τ.λ.: *since they suppose*. For this use of the participle Bengel compares Rom. ii. 18, 20, 2 Tim. ii. 21, Heb. vi. 6.

πορισμόν: *a means of gain, quaestus*. The commentators quote Plutarch, *Cato Major*, § 25, **δυσὶ κεχρῆσθαι μόνοις πορισμοῖς, γεωργίᾳ καὶ φειδοῖ.**

τὴν εὐσέβειαν: not *godliness* in general, *pietatem* (Vulg.), but *the profession of Christianity, culturam Dei* (m[50]). See ii. 2. Allusions elsewhere to those who supposed that the gospel was a means of making money have usually reference to self-interested and grasping teachers (2 Cor. xi. 12, xii. 17, 18; Tit. i. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 3). Here the significance of the clause may be that the false teachers demoralised slaves, suggesting to slaves who were converts, or possible converts, that the profession of Christianity involved an improvement in social position and worldly prospects. The article before **εὐσεβ.** shews that the A.V. is wrong, *supposing that gain is godliness*.

Ver. 6. The repetition of **πορισμός** in a fresh idealised sense is parallel to the transfigured sense in which **νομίμως** is used in i. 8.

αὐταρκείας: not here *sufficientia* (Vulg.), though that is an adequate rendering in 2 Cor. ix. 8. St. Paul did not mean to express the sentiment of the A.V. of Eccles. vii. 11, "Wisdom is good with an inheritance". *Contentment* does not even give his meaning. Contentment is relative to one's lot; **αὐτάρκεια** is more profound, and denotes independence of, and indifference to, any lot; a man's finding not only his resources in himself, but being indifferent to everything else besides. This was St. Paul's condition when he had learnt to be **αὐτάρκης**, Phil. iv. 11. "Lord of himself, though not of lands" (Sir. H. Wot-

οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον,[1] ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι δυνάμεθα· 8. ἔχοντες δὲ [a] διατροφὰς[2] καὶ [b] σκεπάσματα, τούτοις [c] ἀρκεσθησόμεθα. 9. οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν [d] ἐμπίπτουσιν εἰς πειρασμὸν καὶ [e] παγίδα[3] καὶ ἐπιθυμίας πολλὰς [f] ἀνοήτους[4] καὶ [g] βλαβεράς, αἵτινες [h] βυθίζουσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς [i] ὄλεθρον καὶ

a 1 Macc. vi. 49 only. b Here only, not LXX. c Luke iii. 14, Heb. xiii. 5. d See 1 Tim. iii. 6. e 1 Tim. iii. 7, 2 Tim. ii. 26. f Luke xxiv. 25, Rom. i. 14, Gal. iii. 1, 3, Tit. iii. 3. g Prov. x. 26 only. h 2 Macc. xii. 4, Luke v. 7 only. i 1 Cor. v. 5, 1 Thess. v. 3, 2 Thess. i. 9 only, N.T.

[1] Ins. **δῆλον** ℵ[c]D[bc]KLP; ins. **ἀληθὲς** D*, *verum* (*quoniam*) d, *verum* (*quia*) m98, *haud dubium* (*quia*) f, vg., [*h*]*aut dubium*, *verum tamen* fuld., *verum* Cyp., go., syrr.; om. **δῆλον** ℵ*AFG, 17, g, r, vgsome MSS, sah., boh., arm.

[2] So ℵAL, f, vg.; **διατροφὴν** DFGKP, d, g, m98, r (*victum*).

[3] Ins. **τοῦ διαβόλου** D*FG, 37mg, 238, d, f, g, m98 (not r), vg. (not am.), go.

[4] **ἀνόητους** 2, two others, d, f, g, vg., Cyp., Ambrst. (*inutilia*) m98 (*quae nihil prosunt*) r (*stulta*).

ton). See chap. iv. 8. The popular as opposed to the philosophical use of **αὐτάρκεια**, as evidenced by the papyri, is simply *enough*. See Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 375.

Ver. 7. The reasoning of this clause depends on the evident truth that since a man comes naked into this world (Job. i. 21), and when he leaves it can "take nothing for his labour, which he may carry away in his hand" (Eccles. v. 15; Ps. xlix. 17), nothing the world can give is any addition to the man himself. He is a complete man, though naked (Matt. vi. 25; Luke xii. 15; Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* lii. 25, "Non licet plus efferre quam intuleris").

Field is right in supposing that if **δῆλον**, as read in the Received Text, is spurious, yet "there is an ellipsis of **δῆλον**, or that **ὅτι** is for **δῆλον ὅτι**. L. Bos adduces but one example of this ellipsis, 1 John iii. 20: **ὅτι ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία, ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν**; in which, if an ellipsis of **δῆλον** before the second **ὅτι** were admissible, it would seem to offer an easy explanation of that difficult text." Field adds two examples from St. Chrysostom. Hort's conjecture that "**ὅτι** is no more than an accidental repetition of the last two letters of **κόσμον, ΟΝ** being read as **ΟΤΙ**" is almost certainly right.

Ver. 8. **ἔχοντες δέ**: The **δέ** has a slightly adversative force, guarding against a too literal conclusion from ver. 7. It is true that "unaccommodated man" (*Lear*, iii. 4) is "a man for a' that," yet he has wants while alive, though his real wants are few.

σκεπάσματα: may include clothes and shelter, *covering* (R.V.), *tegumentum* (r), *quibus tegamur*, as the Vulg. well puts it; but the word is used of clothing only in Josephus (*B. J.* ii. 8. 5; *Ant.* xv. 9, 2). So A.V., *raiment*, d, *vestitum* (so Chrys.).

Jacob specifies only "bread to eat and raiment to put on" (Gen. xxviii. 20); but the Son of Sirach is more indulgent to the natural man (Ecclus. xxix. 21, xxxix. 26, 27).

ἀρκεσθησόμεθα: This future is imperatival, or authoritative, as Alf. calls it. He cites in illustration, Matt. v. 48, **ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι.** From this point of view, the R.V., *We shall be therewith content*, *cf.* reff., is preferable to his rendering (which is equivalent to R.V. m.), *With these we shall be sufficiently provided* (*cf.* Matt. xxv. 9; John vi. 7; 2 Cor. xii. 9).

Ver. 9. **οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι**: St. Chrysostom calls attention to the fact that St. Paul does not say, *They that are rich*, but *They that desire to be rich* (R.V.), they that make the acquisition of riches their aim. The warning applies to all grades of wealth: all come under it whose ambition is to have more money than that which satisfies their accustomed needs. We are also to note that what is here condemned is not an ambition to excel in some lawful department of human activity, which though it may bring an increase in riches, develops character, but the having a single eye to the accumulation of money by any means. This distinction is drawn in Prov. xxviii. 20: "A faithful man shall abound with blessings: But he that maketh haste to be rich shall not be unpunished".

ἐμπίπτουσιν. Wetstein notes the close parallel in the words of Seneca: "Dum divitias consequi volumus in mala

k Matt. vii. 13, Acts viii. 20, Rom. ix. 22, Heb. x. 39, Rev. xvii. 8, 11 (all with εἰς). l 4 Macc. i. 26, ii. 15 (?), *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 2. m See 1 Tim. iii. 1. n Mark. xiii. 22. o Here only, not LXX. p Rom. ix. 2 only, N.T. q Rom. xi. 17, 20, xiv. 10, 2 Tim. iii. 10, 14, iv. 5, Tit. ii. 1.

k ἀπώλειαν. 10. ῥίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ [1] φιλαργυρία· ἧς τινὲς [m] ὀρεγόμενοι [n] ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἑαυτοὺς [o] περιέπειραν [p] ὀδύναις πολλαῖς. 11. [q] Σὺ [q] δέ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε [1] Θεοῦ,

[1] Ins. τοῦ all except ℵ*A, 17.

multa incidimus" (*Ep.* 87). *Cf.* also Jas. i. 2, **πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις. πειρασμόν** refers rather to the consequencess of one's money-grubbing spirit on others, **παγίδα** to its disastrous effect on one's own character.

ἀνοήτους καὶ βλαβεράς: The desires in question are foolish, because they cannot be logically defended; they are hurtful, because they hinder true happiness. See Prov. xxiii. 4, "Weary not thyself to be rich".

αἵτινες: qualitative, *such as*.

βυθίζουσιν: The word is found in its literal signification in Luke v. 7. Moulton and Milligan (*Expositor*, vii., vi. 381) illustrate its use here from a papyrus of cent. I B.C., **συνεχέσι πολέμοις καταβυθισθεῖ[σαν] τὴν πόλιν.** Bengel notes on **ἐμπίπτ. βυθίζ.**, "*incidunt: mergunt.* Tristis gradatio." We must not lose sight of **εἰς.** Destruction and perdition are not, strictly speaking, the gulf in which the men are drowned. The lusts, etc., overwhelm them; and *the issue is destruction*, etc. See reff. on **ἀπώλειαν.**

Ver. 10. **ῥίζα, κ.τ.λ.**: *The root of all evils.* The R.V., *a root of all kinds of evil* is not satisfactory. The position of **ῥίζα** in the sentence shows that it is emphatic. Field (*in loc.*) cites similar examples of the absence of the article collected by Wetstein from Athenæus, vii. p. 280 A (**ἀρχὴ καὶ ῥίζα παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ ἡ τῆς γαστρὸς ἡδονή**), and Diog. Lært. vi. 50; and adds five others from his own observation. It is, besides, unreasonable in the highest degree to expect that, on the ground of his inspiration, St. Paul's ethical statements in a letter should be expressed with the precision of a text book. When one is dealing with a degrading vice of any kind, the interests of virtue are not served by qualified assertions.

φιλαργυρία: *avaritia* (r) rather than *cupiditas* (d, m, Vulg.). The use of this word supports the exposition given above of ver. 9. Love of money, meanness and covert dishonesty where money is concerned, is the basest species of the genus **πλεονεξία.**

ἧς: In sense the relative refers to **ἀργύριον**, understood out of **φιλαργυρία**, with which it agrees in grammar. The meaning is clear enough; but the expression of it is inaccurate. This occurs when a man's power of grammatical expression cannot keep pace with his thought. Alf. cites as parallels, Rom. viii. 24, **ἐλπὶς βλεπομένη**, and Acts xxiv. 15, **ἐλπίδα . . . ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προσδέχονται.**

τινες: See note on ch. i. 3.

ὀρεγόμενοι: *reaching after* (R.V.) expresses the most defensible aspect of *coveting* (A.V.).

ἀπεπλανήθησαν: *peregrinati sunt* (r) *erraverunt* (d, Vulg.). The faith is a very practical matter. *Have been led astray* (R.V.) continues the description of the man who allows himself to be the passive subject of temptation. Chrys. illustrates the use of this word here from an absent-minded man's passing his destination without knowing it.

περιέπειραν: *inseruerunt se.* The force of **περί** in this compound is intensive, as in **περιάπτω, περικαλύπτω, περικρατής, περικρύπτω, περίλυπος.**

ὀδύναις πολλαῖς: There is a touch of pity in this clause, so poignantly descriptive of a worldling's disillusionment.

Vv. 11-16 are a digression into a personal appeal. *Cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 1, iii. 10, 14, iv. 5.

Ver. 11. **ὦ ἄνθρωπε θεοῦ**: It argues a very inadequate appreciation of the fervour of the writer to suppose, as Theod. does, that this is an official title. The apostrophe is a personal appeal, arising out of the topic of other-worldliness which begins in ver. 5. Timothy, as a Christian man, had been called to a heavenly citizenship. He was a *man of God, i.e.*, a man belonging to the spiritual order of things with which that which is merely temporal, transitory and perishing can have no permanent relationship. The term occurs again, with an admittedly general reference, in 2 Tim. iii. 17. In any case *Man of God*, as an official title, belonged to prophets, the prophets of the Old Covenant; and we have no

ταῦτα [r] φεῦγε· [s] δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην, [t] εὐσέβειαν, [u] πίστιν, [u] ἀγάπην, r 1 Cor. vi. 18, x. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 22.
[v] ὑπομονήν, [w] πραϋπάθιαν.[1] 12. [x] ἀγωνίζου [y] τὸν [y] καλὸν [y] ἀγῶνα s Rom. ix. 30, 31, xii. 13, xiv. 19, 1 Cor. xiv. 1, 1 Thess
τῆς πίστεως· [z] ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς [a] αἰωνίου [a] ζωῆς, εἰς ἣν [2] ἐκλήθης, καὶ
[b] ὡμολόγησας τὴν καλὴν [c] ὁμολογίαν ἐνώπιον πολλῶν μαρτύρων.

v. 15, 2 Tim. ii. 22, Heb. xii. 14, 1 Pet. iii. 11. t See 1 Tim. ii. 2. u See 1 Tim. i. 14.
v Rom. v. 3, 2 Cor. vi. 4, xii. 12, Col. i. 11, 2 Tim. iii. 10, Tit. ii. 2, 2 Pet. i. 6, etc. w Here only, not LXX. x See 1 Tim. iv. 10. y 2 Tim. iv. 7, *cf.* Phil. i. 30, Col. ii. 1, 1 Thess. ii. 2, Heb. xii. 1. z 1 Tim. vi. 19. a See 1 Tim. i. 16. b John i. 20, ix. 22, xii. 42, Acts xxiii. 8, Rom. x. 9, 10, Tit. i. 16, Heb. xi. 13, xiii. 15, etc. c Heb. iii. 1, iv. 14, x. 23.

[1] So ℵ*AFG[P]; **πραότητα** [ℵcD*] DcKL, [31].
[2] Ins. **καὶ** 37, some others, syrhcl c.*

proof that Timothy was a prophet of the New Covenant, though he was an evangelist (2 Tim. iv. 5), and possibly an apostle (1 Thess. ii. 6).

ταῦτα: *i.e.*, **φιλαργυρία** and its attendant evils. Love of money in ministers of religion does more to discredit religion in the eyes of ordinary people than would indulgence in many grosser vices.

It is to be noted that **φεῦγε· δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην, πίστιν, ἀγάπην** recurs in 2 Tim. ii. 22. The phraseology is based on Prov. xv. 9, **διώκοντας δὲ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷ**, and is thoroughly Pauline, as the reff. prove. The six virtues fall perhaps into three pairs, as Ell. suggests: "**δικαιοσ.** and **εὐσέβ.** have the widest relations, pointing to general conformity to God's law and practical piety [*cf.* **σωφρόνως κ. δικαίως κ. εὐσεβῶς**, Tit. ii. 12]; **πίστις** and **ἀγάπη** are the fundamental principles of Christianity; **ὑπομ.** and **πραϋπ.** the principles on which a Christian ought to act towards his gainsayers and opponents". As a group, they are contrasted with the group of vices in vv. 4 and 5; but we cannot arrange them in pairs of opposites. We may add that **πίστις** results in **ὑπομονή** (Jas. i. 3; Rom. v. 3; 2 Thess. i. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. ii. 2; Heb. xii. 1), as **ἀγάπη** does in **πραϋπάθεια. ὑπομονή** is *sustinentia* (r here, and Vulg. in 1 Thess. i. 3) rather than *patientia* (d and Vulg. here).

πίστις, ἀγάπη, and **ὑπομονή** are also combined in Tit. ii. 2; *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 10, also 2 Pet. i. 5-7, where **εὐσέβεια,** with other virtues, forms part of the group.

Ver. 12. **ἀγωνίζου . . . ἀγῶνα**: There is evidence that **ἀγωνίζομαι ἀγῶνα** had become a stereotyped expression, perhaps from the line of Euripides: **καίτοι καλόν γ' ἂν τόνδ' ἀγῶν' ἠγωνίσω** (*Alcestis*, 648 or 664). See an Athenian inscription quoted by Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 370. Nevertheless the metaphor has its full force here, and in 2 Tim. iv. 7: *Engage in the contest which profession of the faith entails; it is a noble one.* Allusions to the public games are notoriously Pauline (1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 12). The present imperative indicates the continuous nature of the **ἀγών,** while the aor. **ἐπιλαβοῦ** expresses the single act of laying hold of the prize (so ver. 19). It does not seem an insuperable objection to this view that **καταλαμβάνω** is the word used in 1 Cor. ix. 24, Phil. iii. 12. On the other hand, Winer-Moulton (*Gram.*, p. 392) argues from the asyndeton (*cf.* Mark iv. 39) that **ἐπιλαβοῦ, κ.τ.λ.** forms one notion with **ἀγωνίζου**; that "it is not the result of the contest, but itself the substance of the striving". Yet in ver. 19 (**ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς**) there is nothing in the context suggestive of struggle.

εἰς ἣν ἐκλήθης: We are called to eternal life (1 Cor. i. 9; 1 Pet. v. 10); it is placed well within our reach; but it is not put into our hands; each man must grasp it for himself.

καὶ ὡμολόγησας, κ.τ.λ.: This clause has no syntactical connexion with what has preceded. It refers to **ἀγῶνα,** the contest on which Timothy entered at his baptism, when he was called, enrolled as a soldier in the army of Jesus Christ (2 Tim. ii. 4; 1 Cor. ix. 7), and professed fidelity to his new Leader (his response to the divine call) before many witnesses. **ὁμολογία** is perhaps best referred to a formal profession of faith, here as in the reff. Cyril Jer., when recalling the baptismal ceremonies to the newly baptised, says in reference to their profession of belief in the Trinity, **ὡμολογήσατε τὴν σωτήριον ὁμολογίαν** (*Cat.* xx. 4).

In the primitive Church the baptism of an individual was a matter in which the Church generally took an interest and part. The rule laid down in *The Didache*,

d See 1 Tim. 1 3. [d] Παραγγέλλω σοι [1] [e] ἐνώπιον [e] τοῦ [2] [e] Θεοῦ τοῦ [f] ζωογονοῦντος [3]
i. 3.
e See 1 Tim. τὰ πάντα καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [4] τοῦ [g] μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου
ii. 3.
f 1 Sam. ii. 6, Luke xvii. 33, Acts vii. 19. g John v. 32, 1 John v. 10, with acc.

[1] Om. σοι ℵ*FG, 17 [g, *praecipio tibi t contestor*]. [2] Om. τοῦ ℵ.

[3] So ADFGP, 17, 31, four others; ζωοποιοῦντος ℵKL.

[4] So ADKLP, 17, 31, 37, many others, d, vg., go., syrhcl, armcodd; Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵFG, more than five cursives, f, g, syrpesh, sah., boh., armed.

7, shows this: "Before the baptism let him that baptizeth and him that is baptized fast, and any others also who are able". Also Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 61, **ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς.** These passages explain "the many witnesses" of Timothy's good confession. It is not so natural to refer *the good confession* to a crisis of persecution, or to his ordination. The epithet **καλήν** here and in the following verse does not characterise the particular act of confession made by Timothy or by Christ, but refers to the class of confession, its import, as Ell. says.

Ver. 13. **παραγγέλλω σοι**: St. Paul passes in thought from the past epoch in Timothy's life, with its human witnesses, among whom was the apostle himself, to the present probation of Timothy, St. Paul far away; and he feels impelled to remind his lieutenant that there are Witnesses of his conduct whose real though unseen presence is an encouragement as well as a check. See on v. 21.

ζωογονοῦντος: This word has the sense *preserve alive*, as R.V. m. See reff. A good example from O.T. is 1 Sam. ii. 6, **Κύριος θανατοῖ καὶ ζωογονεῖ.** The word has here a special appropriateness. Timothy is stimulated to exhibit moral courage by an assurance that he is in the hands of One whose protective power is universal, and by the example of One who, as Man, put that protective power to a successful test, and was "saved out of death" (Heb. v. 7).

τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν must have the same reference here as in the preceding verse. We have seen that in the case of Timothy, it means his baptismal profession of faith in God as revealed by Jesus Christ. In the case of Jesus Himself it is best understood of His habitual sense of His heavenly Father's presence and protection, which found its supreme expression on the Cross (Luke xxiv. 46).

μαρτυρήσαντος: Although Jesus, as Man, and His followers make the same **ὁμολογία,** yet their respective relations to it are different. **μαρτυρέω** indicates a power of origination and authentication which **ὁμολογέω** does not. The utterances and acts of Jesus, as Man, are human; yet He spoke and acted as no other man ever did. Matt. xvii. 27 ("That take, and give unto them for *me and thee*," not "for *us*") and John xx. 17 ("I ascend unto *my* Father *and your* Father," etc. not *our* Father or *our* God) illustrate very well this difference between Jesus and His brethren in relations which they share alike. This is why St. Paul does not here use **ὁμολογέω ὁμολογίαν** of Christ, but employs instead the unusual **μαρτυρέω ὁμολογίαν.** Jesus is **ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός,** Rev. i. 5, **ὁ μαρτ. ὁ πιστ. καὶ ἀληθινός,** Rev. iii. 14. Bengel suggests that the two verbs indicate the attitudes of the bystanders in each case: "*confessus est*, cum assensione testium: *testatus est*, non assentiente Pilato". The Vulg. treats **τὴν καλ. ὁμολ.** as an acc. of closer specification, *qui testimonium reddidit sub Pontio Pilato, bonam confessionem.*

ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πειλάτου: With the explanation of the **ὁμολογία** of Jesus which has just been given, it would be natural to render this, with the Vulg., *under Pontius Pilate*; and this view is favoured by the change from **ἐνώπιον,** ver. 12, to **ἐπί,** and by the likelihood that this is a fragment of a creed. Yet the rendering *before Pontius Pilate* (Chrys., etc.), is not inconsistent with the notion that the **ὁμολογία** in one sense was made all during our Lord's ministry; for undoubtedly from one point of view it was when Jesus' life was hanging in the balance, depending on the decision of Pontius Pilate, that His trust in the protective love of His Father was most tried. His calm repose of soul on the assurance of God's wise and good disposition of events is well illustrated by His words as recorded in John xix. 11, "Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above". Until it has been been proved that the Fourth Gospel is not a record of facts, it is reasonable to suppose that St. Paul and his contem-

Πειλάτου τὴν καλὴν [h]ὁμολογίαν, 14. [i]τηρῆσαί σε τὴν ἐντολὴν [k]ἄσπιλον [l]ἀνεπίλημπτον μέχρι τῆς [m]ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 15. ἣν [n]καιροῖς [n]ἰδίοις δείξει ὁ [o]μακάριος καὶ

h See ver. 12
i 2 Tim. iv. 7, see note.
k Jas. i. 27, 1 Pet. i. 19, 2 Pet. iii. 14, not LXX.
l See 1 Tim. iii. 2.
m 2 Thess. ii. 8, 2 Tim. i. 10, iv. 1, 8, Tit, ii. 13.
n See 1 Tim. ii. 6.
o 1 Tim. i. 11.

poraries were acquainted with the general account of the trial of Jesus as therein described.

Ver. 14. **τηρῆσαι κ.τ.λ.**: The phrase **τηρεῖν τὴν ἐντολήν, τὰς ἐντολάς** or **τὸν λόγον, τοὺς λόγους** is a common one; found in Matt. xix. 17, and especially in the Johannine writings; but wherever it occurs it means *to obey* or *observe* a command or a saying; whereas here it means *to preserve intact*. Perhaps the two meanings were present to the apostle's mind; and no doubt in actual experience they merge one into the other; for a tradition is only preserved by obedience to the demand which it makes for observance. This use of the verb and the similar **τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα**, 2 Tim. iv. 7, mutually illustrate each other. **τὴν ἐντολὴν τηρεῖν** is probably equivalent to **τὴν παραθήκην φυλάσσειν**, understanding the *tradition* or *deposit* in the most comprehensive moral and spiritual sense, in which it is nothing else than "the law of the Gospel (*cf.* **ἡ παραγγελία**, i. 5), the Gospel viewed as a rule of life" (so Ell. and Alf.). St. Paul would not have distinguished this from the charge given to Timothy at his baptism. Cyril Jer. (*Cat.* v. 13), in quoting this passage, substitutes **ταύτην τὴν παραδεδομένην πίστιν** for **ἐντολήν**. This interpretation is permissible so long as we do not divorce creed from character.

ἄσπιλον ἀνεπίλημπτον: These epithets present a difficulty somewhat similar to that presented by **τηρῆσαι**. **ἄσπιλος** is a personal epithet (though applied to **οὐρανός**, Job. xv. 15, Symm.); and so is **ἀνεπίλημπτος**. See reff. on both. Alford shows, after De Wette, by examples from Philo and Plato, that **ἀνεπίλ.** may be applied to impersonal objects, such as **τέχνη, τὸ λεγόμενον**. Nevertheless although it would be intolerably awkward to refer the adjectives to **σε**—the ordinary construction with **τηρεῖν** being that the qualifying adj. should belong to its object, *e.g.*, 1 Tim. v. 22; Jas. i. 27; 2 Cor. xi. 9 (Alf.)—yet St. Paul had the personal reference to Timothy chiefly in his mind when he chose these words as qualifying **ἐντολήν**; and the R.V., which places a comma after *commandment*, possibly is intended to suggest a similar view. The man and the word are similarly identified in the parable of the Sower (Matt. xiii. 19, etc.). If Timothy "keeps himself unspotted" (Jas. i. 27) and "without reproach," the **ἐντολή**, so far as he is concerned, will be maintained flawless.

The Ancient Homily which used to be attributed to Clem. Rom. contains a sentence written in a similar tone (§ 8), **τηρήσατε τὴν σάρκα ἁγνὴν καὶ τὴν σφραγῖδα ἄσπιλον, ἵνα τὴν ζωὴν ἀπολάβωμεν.**

μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας, κ.τ.λ.: Death may mark the close of our probation state; but we shall not render the account of our stewardship until the **ἐπιφάνεια**. When the Pastorals were written the **ἐπιφάνεια** had in men's thoughts of it receded beyond each man's death. At an earlier period Christians set it before them as men now set death. In 2 Thess. ii. 8 the compound phrase occurs **ἐπιφάν. τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ. ἐπιφάνεια** is the term used in the Pastoral Epistles (see reff.); but the Second Coming of Christ is called **παρουσία** in 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23, 2 Thess. ii. 1. In 2 Tim. i. 19, **ἐπιφάνεια** includes the first manifestation of Christ in the flesh; and this application of the term is in exact correspondence with its use in heathen sacred associations, where it denoted "a conspicuous appearance or intervention of the higher powers on behalf of their worshippers". The title **ἐπιφανής**, assumed by the Seleucidæ, meant a claim to be worshipped as an incarnation of Zeus or Apollo, as the case might be (see Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 380).

Ver. 15. **καιροῖς ἰδίοις**: See note on ii. 6. *In due season* may refer primarily either to the appropriateness of the occasion of the **ἐπιφάνεια** or to the supreme will of the **δυνάστης**. The wording of the discouragement given by Jesus, in Acts i. 7, to those who would pry into the future makes it natural to suppose that this latter notion chiefly was in St. Paul's mind here (**καιροὺς οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ**). We may perhaps put it thus: A devout mind recog-

μόνος [p] Δυνάστης, ὁ [q] Βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ Κύριος τῶν [r] κυριευόντων, 16. ὁ μόνος ἔχων [s] ἀθανασίαν, φῶς [t] οἰκῶν [u] ἀπρόσιτον, ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται· ᾧ τιμὴ καὶ [v] κράτος αἰώνιον· ἀμήν.

17. Τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν [w] τῷ [w] νῦν [w] αἰῶνι παραγγελλε μὴ [y] ὑψη-

p Ecclus. xlvi. 5, 16, 2 Macc. (8), 3 Macc. (4).
q *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 17.
r Luke xxii. 25.
s Here only N.T., Wisd. (5), 4 Macc. (2).
t Rom. (4), 1 Cor. (3).
u Here only, not LXX.
v 1 Pet. iv. 11 v. 11, Jude 25, Rev. i. 6, v. 13.
w 2 Tim. iv. 10, Tit. ii. 12.
x See 1 Tim. i. 3.
y Here only, not LXX, *cf.* Rom. xi. 20, xii. 16.

nises the providential ordering of past events as having taken place at the time best fitted for them, and shrinks from the presumption of guessing the appropriate time for future events. Thus there is no presumption in saying "When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son"; and when the time is ripe, He will send Him again (Acts iii. 20).

δείξει: Ell. well explains the force of this verb from John ii. 18, **τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν**; The last **ἐπιφάνεια** will be the final *proof* offered by God to the human race.

The terms of this magnificent characterisation of God are an expansion of the epithets in the doxology in i. 17 *q.v.*

μακάριος: See on i. 11. Philo (*de Sacrific. Abelis et Caini*, p. 147) has the remarkable parallel, **περὶ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου, καὶ ἀφθάρτου, καὶ ἀτρέπτου, καὶ ἁγίου, καὶ μόνου μακαρίου.**

δυνάστης is found as a title of God in the Apocrypha. See reff., esp. 2 Macc. iii. 24, **ὁ . . . δυνάστης ἐπιφανίαν μεγάλην ἐποίησεν.** It occurs in the ordinary sense, Luke i. 52, Acts viii. 27. The choice of the phrase **μόνος δυν.** here was perhaps suggested by the thought of His absolute and irresponsible power in arranging the times and seasons for the affairs of men. It is unnecessary to seek any special polemical object in **μόνος**, as exclusive of dualism. As has been already suggested (on i. 17), the predications of glory to God that occur in these epistles are probably repeated from eucharistic prayers uttered by St. Paul in the discharge of his prophetic liturgical functions.

ὁ βασιλεύς, κ.τ.λ.: The Vulg. renders rather inconsistently, *Rex regum et Dominus dominantium.* So also in Rev. xix. 16. It is not quite obvious why the phrase is varied from the usual **βασιλεὺς βασιλέων** (2 Macc. xiii. 4; Rev. xvii. 14, xix. 16) and **Κύριος [τῶν] Κυρίων** (Deut. x. 17; Ps. cxxxvi. 3; Enoch ix. 4). Perhaps the participle gives new vigour to a phrase that had lost its freshness.

Ver. 16. **ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν**: God the Father is the subject of this whole attribution; and it is the Catholic doctrine that He alone has endless existence as His *essential* property. (**οὐσίᾳ ἀθάνατος οὐ μετουσίᾳ**, Theod. *Dial.* iii. p. 145, quoted by Ell.). God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are co-eternal with the Father; but Their life is derived from and dependent on His. This is expressly declared by Christ of Himself, "As the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself" (John v. 26). On this Westcott notes: "The Son has not life only as given, but life *in Himself* as being a spring of life. . . . The tense (*gave*) carries us back beyond time". Accordingly, the creed of Cæsarea, which formed the basis of that adopted at Nicea, spoke of the Son as **Ζωὴν ἐκ Ζωῆς**; a doctrine sufficiently expressed in the other phrase, **Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός**, which has survived.

φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον: This is a grander conception than that in Ps. civ. 2, "Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment". Here, if one may venture so to express it, the Person of God is wholly concealed by His dwelling, which is light; and this dwelling is itself unapproachable. Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 5. 1, says that God was thought to dwell in Mount Sinai, **φοβερὸν καὶ ἀπρόσιτον.** (See also Philo, *de Vita Mosis*, ii. [iii.] 2 cited by Dean Bernard).

ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων: None *of men*; only the Son (John i. 18; Matt. xi. 27, etc.).

κράτος: For this word in doxologies see reff.

Ver. 17. **ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι**: It is the present contrast, not that between riches in this world and riches in the world to come (as Chrys.), that the apostle has in mind. Those who have money may, as well as those "that are poor as to the world," be "rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom, etc." (Jas. ii. 5). The passage indicates that the Church had affected Society more widely in Ephesus than it

λοφρονεῖν,[1] μηδὲ [z]ἠλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλούτου [a]ἀδηλότητι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ[2 3] Θεῷ[4] τῷ [b]παρέχοντι ἡμῖν[5] πάντα [c]πλουσίως[6] εἰς [d]ἀπόλαυσιν, 18. [e]ἀγαθοεργεῖν, πλουτεῖν ἐν [f]ἔργοις [f]καλοῖς, [g]εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, [h]κοινωνικούς, 19. [i]ἀποθησαυρίζοντας ἑαυτοῖς [k]θεμέλιον καλὸν [l]εἰς [l]τὸ [l]μέλλον, ἵνα [m]ἐπιλάβωνται τῆς [n]ὄντως[7] ζωῆς.

z See 1 Tim. iv. 10. a Here only, not LXX. b 1 Tim. i. 4, Luke vii. 4, Acts xxviii. 2, Col. iv. 1. c Col. iii. 16, Tit. iii. 6, 2 Pet. i. 11, not LXX. d 3 Macc. vii. 16, Heb. xi. 25 only. e Acts xiv. 17, not LXX. f See 1 Tim. iii. 1. g Here only, not LXX. h Here only, not LXX. i Ecclus. iii. 4 only. k Rom. xv. 20, 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11, 12, Eph. ii. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 19, Heb. vi. 1. l Luke xiii. 9. m 1 Tim. vi. 12. n See 1 Tim. v. 3.

[1] ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν א. [2] ἐν DcKL.
[3] Ins. τῷ ADcKLP; om. τῷ אD*FG, three cursives arm.
[4] Ins. [τῷ]ζῶντι DKL, d, e, m22, vg. (am. not fuld*), syrr.
[5] Ins. τὰ A, 37, a few others.
[6] πλουσίως πάντα a few cursives. [7] αἰωνίου DcKLP.

had at Corinth when St. Paul wrote, "Not many mighty, not many noble, are called" (1 Cor. i. 26). It is to be observed that the expression **ὁ νῦν αἰών** is only found in N.T. in the Pastoral Epistles (see reff.). **ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος** is the expression elsewhere in N.T. (Matt. xii. 32; Luke xvi. 8, xx. 34; Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6 (bis), 8, iii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. i. 21). Both represent the Rabbinic עולם הזה, the present age, as contrasted with עולם הבא, the age to come. St. Paul also has **ὁ κόσμος οὗτος** in 1 Cor. iii. 19, v. 10, vii. 31, and **ὁ νῦν καιρός** in Rom. iii. 26, viii. 18, xi. 5, 2 Cor. viii. 14. See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on Eph. i. 21. It does not follow that because these are renderings of the same Hebrew expression, they meant the same to a Greek ear. In the three places in which **ὁ νῦν αἰών** occurs it has a definite material physical sense; whereas **ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος** has a more notional ethical force.

ἠλπικέναι ἐπί: *have their hope set on.* See note on iv. 10. For the thought compare Job. xxxi. 24, Ps. xlix. 6, lii. 7, Prov. xi. 28, Mark x. 24.

ἠλπικ. ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι: This vigorous oxymoron is not quite parallel in form to **ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς**, Rom. vi. 4, as Ell. suggests. There **ζωῆς** is a further definition of the **καινότης**, the prominent notion. This is a rhetorical intensifying of *riches which are uncertain*; **πλούτου** is the prominent word. "When the genitive stands before the governing noun, it is emphatic" (Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 240). For the thought *cf.* Prov. xxiii. 5, xxvii. 24.

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ θεῷ: God who cannot change, who abides faithful, is contrasted with the uncertainty of riches which are unreal.

τῷ παρέχ. πάντα πλουσίως: *cf.* Acts xiv. 17.

εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν: This is a greater concession to the sensuous view of life than the **εἰς μετάληψιν** of iv. 3. It approaches the declaration of the Preacher that for a man to "eat and drink, and make his soul enjoy good in his labour . . . is from the hand of God" (Eccles. ii. 24), "the gift of God" (Eccles. iii. 13, v. 19). No good purpose is served by pretending that God did not intend us to enjoy the pleasurable sensations of physical life. After all, things that have been enjoyed have served their purpose; they have "perished," yet "with the using" (Col. ii. 22). Obviously, they cannot take God's place as an object of hope.

Ver. 18. **ἀγαθοεργεῖν**: corrects any possible misunderstanding of **εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν. πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς**: see note on iii. 1. *Cf.* **εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν**, Luke xii. 21.

εὐμεταδότους: *facile tribuere* (Vulg.), *ready to impart* (*cf.* the use of **μεταδίδωμι** in Luke iii. 11; Rom. i. 11, xii. 8; Eph. iv. 28; 1 Thess. ii. 8).

κοινωνικούς: This does not mean *sociable* (A.V. m.), *ready to sympathise* (R.V. m.), as Chrys., and Thdrt. explain it, but **ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες**, Rom. xii. 13 (*cf.* Gal. vi. 6; Phil. iv. 15). A good illustration of the general sentiment is Heb. xiii. 16, **τῆς δὲ εὐποιΐας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε.** Von Soden notes that the thought in **εὐμεταδ.** is of the needs of others, in **κοινων.** of the imparting of one's own.

Ver. 19. **ἀποθησαυρίζοντας**: The true hoarding produces, as its first result, a good foundation, which will entitle a man to grasp the prize, which is true life, the only life worth talking about.

o 2 Tim. i. 12, 14, *cf.* Lev. vi. 2, 4, Tob. x. 13, 2 Macc. iii. 10, 15. p See 1 Tim. v. 21. q See 1 Tim. i. 6. r See 1 Tim. i. 9. s 2 Tim. ii. 16. t 2 Tim. ii. 16, not LXX. u Here only, not LXX. v Here only, not LXX.

20. Ὦ Τιμόθεε, τὴν [o]παραθήκην [1 o p]φύλαξον, [q]ἐκτρεπόμενος [r s]τὰς βεβήλους [s t]κενοφωνίας[2] καὶ [u]ἀντιθέσεις τῆς [v]ψευδωνύμου

[1] παρακαταθήκην many cursives.

[2] καινοφωνίας FG, a few cursives, d, e, f, g, m50, vg. (*vocum novitates*).

Stability is the essential characteristic of a foundation. There is a contrast implied between the shifting uncertainty of riches, as a ground of hope, and the firm and permanent foundation of a Christian character. (So, nearly, Theod.)

Ingenious conjectures have been suggested for **θεμέλιον**; but it is safe to say that the mixture of metaphors—due to the condensation of language—does not distress those who read in a devout rather than in a critical spirit. For the sentiment *cf.* Matt. vi. 19, 20. There is some support given to the conjecture of Lamb-Bos, **θέμα λίαν**, by the parallel from Tobit iv. 8 *sq.* cited by Bengel, **μὴ φοβοῦ ποιεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην· θέμα γὰρ ἀγαθὸν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ εἰς ἡμέραν ἀνάγκης.** See, on the other hand, what Ecclus. i. 15 says of Wisdom, **μετὰ ἀνθρώπων θεμέλιον αἰῶνος ἐνόσσευσεν. θεμέλιος** is used metaphorically also in reff. It is to be observed that in 2 Tim. ii. 19 there is again a confusion of imagery: the foundation has a seal.

εἰς τὸ μέλλον is found in a slightly different sense (*thenceforth*), Luke xiii. 9.

ἐπιλάβωνται: See on ver. 12.

τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς: *the life which is life indeed*, an expression which is one of the precious things of the R.V. It is "the life which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. i. 1).

For **ὄντως** see v. 3.

Ver. 20. As Ell. points out, this concluding apostrophe, like the last paragraph in 2 Cor. (xiii. 11 *sqq.*), is a summary of the whole epistle.

On the intensity of the appeal in the use of the personal name see on i. 18.

τὴν παραθήκην: *depositum*. The term occurs in a similar connexion with **φυλάσσω**, 2 Tim. i. 14, and also in 2 Tim. i. 12, where see note. Here, and in 2 Tim. i. 14, it means, as Chrys. explains, **ἡ πίστις, τὸ κήρυγμα**; so Vincent of Lerins, from whose *Commonitorium* (c. 22) Alf. quotes. "Quid est *depositum*? id est, quod tibi creditum est, non quod a te inventum; quod accepisti, non quod excogitasti; rem non ingenii, sed doctrinae; non usurpationis privatae, sed publicae traditionis . . . catholicae fidei talentum inviolatum illibatumque conserva. . . . Aurum accepisti, aurum redde: nolo mihi pro aliis alia subjicias: nolo pro auro aut impudenter plumbum, aut fraudulenter aeramenta supponas." That the "deposit" is practically identical with the "charge," ch. i. 5, 18, "the sound doctrine," i. 10, "the commandment," vi. 14, is indicated by the use of the cognate verb **παρατίθεμαι** in i. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 2, and the correlative **παρέλαβες**, Col. iv. 17, and even more by the contrast here between it and "the knowledge falsely so called".

ἐκτρεπόμενος: *turning away from, devitans.*

τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας: In 2 Tim. ii. 16 the Vulg. has *vaniloquia*. The rendering *vocum novitates* found here in Vulg. and O.L. represents the variant **καινοφωνίας**. The term does not differ much from **ματαιολογία**, i. 6, which is also rendered *vaniloquium*.

ἀντιθέσεις: In face of the general anarthrous character of the Greek of these epistles it is not certain that the absence of an article before **ἀντιθ.** proves that it is qualified by **βεβήλους**. The meaning of **ἀντιθ.** is partly fixed by **κενοφωνίας**, to which it is in some sort an explanatory appendix; but it must finally depend upon the signification we attach to **τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως**. The epithet **ψευδων.** is sufficient to prove that **γνῶσις** was specially claimed by the heretics whom St. Paul has in his mind. That it should be so is in harmony with the other notices which we find in these epistles suggestive of a puerile and profitless intellectual subtlety, as opposed to the practical moral character of Christianity. We are reminded of the contrast in 1 Cor. viii. 1, "Knowledge puffeth up, but love buildeth up". Hort (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 139 *sqq.*) proves that **γνῶσις** here and elsewhere in N.T. (Luke xi. 52; Rom. ii. 20 *sq.*) refers to the special lore of those who interpreted mystically the O.T., especially the Law. Knowledge which is merely theoretical. the knowledge of God professed by those who "by their works deny Him" (Tit. i.

γνώσεως, 21. ἧν τινες [w] ἐπαγγελλόμενοι [x] περὶ [x] τὴν [x] πίστιν [y] ἠστό-
χησαν.

Ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν.[1]

w 1 Tim. ii. 10.
x 1 Tim. i. 19, 2 Tim. iii. 8.
y See 1 Tim. i. 6.

[1] So ℵAFgrGP, 17, g (*vobiscum t tecum*) boh.; μετὰ σοῦ DKL, d, e, f, vg., syrr., arm.; sah. om. ἡ χάρ.—ὑμῶν; add ἀμήν ℵcDbcKLP, e, f, vg., syrr., boh.

ℵ, 17 add πρὸς Τιμόθεον ā. To this D adds, ἐπληρώθη· ἄρχεται πρὸς Τιμόθεον β, similarly FG. A, etc., have πρὸς Τιμόθεον ā ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας; to which K adds, ἥτις ἐστὶ μητρόπολις Φρυγίας τῆς Πακατιανῆς, similarly L. P has a subscription like that of A, substituting Νικοπόλεως for Λαοδικείας.

16), is not real knowledge. The **ἀντιθέσεις** then of this spurious knowledge would be the dialectical distinctions and niceties of the false teachers. Perhaps *inconsistencies* is what is meant. For an example of **ἀντίθετος** in this sense, see Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., v. 275. Something more definite than (*a*) *oppositions, i.e., objections* of opponents (so Chrys. Theoph. and von Soden, who compares **ἀντιδιατιθεμένους**, 2 Tim. ii. 25) is implied; but certainly not (*b*) the formal categorical oppositions between the Law and the Gospel alleged by Marcion.

Ver. 21. **τινες**: See note on i. 3.

ἐπαγγελλόμενοι: See note on ii. 10.

περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠστόχησαν: See notes on i. 6, 19, and reff.

μεθ' ὑμῶν: An argument in support of the **μετὰ σοῦ** of the Received Text is that **μεθ' ὑμῶν** is indisputably the right reading in the corresponding place in 2 Tim. and Tit., and might have crept in here by assimilation. Ell. has reason on his side when he maintains that the plural here is not sufficient to prove that the epistle as a whole was intended for the Church. "The study of papyri letters will show that the singular and the plural alternated in the same document with apparently no distinction of meaning" (Moulton, *Expositor*, vi., vii. 107). The colophon in the T.R., "The First to Timothy was written from Laodicea, which is the chiefest city of Phrygia Pacatiana," has a double interest: as an echo of the notion that this is the Epistle from Laodicea (Col. iv. 16), a notion sanctioned by Theophyl.; and the mention of Phrygia Pacatiana proves that the author of the note lived after the fourth century, towards the close of which that name for Phrygia Prima came into use.

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ Β̄

a See 1 Tim. i. 1.
b Rom. xv. 32, 1 Cor. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 1, viii. 5, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 1.
c 1 Tim. iv. 8.

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ [a]ἀπόστολος [a]Χριστοῦ [a]Ἰησοῦ [1] [b]διὰ [b]θελήματος [b]Θεοῦ κατ' [c]ἐπαγγελίαν [c d]ζωῆς τῆς [d]ἐν [d]Χριστῷ [d]Ἰησοῦ 2. Τιμοθέῳ [e]ἀγαπητῷ [e]τέκνῳ· χάρις, [f]ἔλεος, εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [2] τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

d Rom. viii. 2. e 1 Cor. iv. 14, 17, Eph. v. 1, see 1 Tim. i. 2. f See 1 Tim. i. 2. g See 1 Tim. i. 12. h Acts xxiv. 14, xxvii. 23, Rom. i. 9, Phil. iii. 3. i See 1 Tim. v. 4. k 1 Tim. iii. 9.

3. [g]Χάριν [g]ἔχω τῷ Θεῷ,[3] ᾧ [h]λατρεύω ἀπὸ [i]προγόνων ἐν [k]καθαρᾷ

[1] Ἰησ. Χριστ. AL, 37, most others, vg., go., syr^{hcl}, arm.

[2] So ℵ^{c}ADFGKL, d, f, g, vg., go., sah., boh., syr^{hcl}, arm.; Κυρίου Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵ*, 17, 37 (so also two cursives, syr^{pesh}, which om. foll. τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν).

[3] Add μου D*, 17, one other, d, e, fuld., go., sah.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1, 2. Salutation.

Ver. 1. **ἀπόστολος Χρ. Ἰησ.** See note on 1 Tim. i. 1.

διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ: This formula is found also in 1 and 2 Cor. Eph. and Col. See note on 1 Tim. i. 1, where it is pointed out that while the same **ἐπιταγή** may be said to be issued by God the Father and God the Son, **θέλημα** is always used of the Father's eternal purpose as regards the salvation of man (Rom. ii. 18, xii. 2; 2 Cor. viii. 5; Gal. i. 4; Eph. i. 5, 9, 11; Col. i. 9, iv. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 18, etc.). St. Paul believed that his own commission as an apostle was a part of God's arrangements to this end, one of the ways in which the Will manifested itself.

κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς, κ.τ.λ.: To be connected with **ἀπόστολος**. His apostleship was *for the accomplishment of the promise*, etc. See Rom. i. 5, **ἐλάβομεν . . . ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν**. For the force of **κατά** with acc. see Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 502. The notion is more largely expressed in the corresponding passage of Tit. (i. 2), **ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο . . . θεός**. We must not suppose that there is any limitation in the reference of the expression here. The mention of "the promise of the life which is in Christ Jesus" (Gal. ii. 19, 20) is not intended as a consolation to Timothy (as Chrys., Bengel), nor was it even specially suggested by his own near approaching death. The preciousness of that promise is never wholly absent from the minds of Christians; though of course it comes to the surface of our consciousness at crises when death is, or seems to be, imminent.

Ver. 2. **ἀγαπητῷ**: On the variation here from **γνησίῳ**, which occurs in 1 Tim. i. 2 and Tit. i. 4, see the note in the former place. Ver. 5 ("the unfeigned faith that is in thee") proves that St. Paul did not wish to hint that Timothy had ceased to be his **γνήσιον τέκνον**. Timothy is St. Paul's **τέκνον ἀγαπητόν** also in 1 Cor. iv. 17. **ἀγαπητός** is complete in itself: it does not require the explanatory addition, **ἐν πίστει**, or **κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν**.

χάρις, κ.τ.λ.: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2.

Vv. 3-7. I know that your weak point is deficiency in moral courage. Be braced, therefore, by the assurance that I am constantly thinking with thankfulness and prayer about your genuine and inborn faith; and by the fact that the gift of the Holy Spirit which you received at ordination was that of power and love and discipline.

Ver. 3. **χάριν ἔχω**: The expression of thanksgiving in the exordium of an

[k] συνειδήσει, ὡς [l] ἀδιάλειπτον [m] ἔχω τὴν περὶ σοῦ [m n] μνείαν ἐν ταῖς l Rom. ix. 2, not LXX.
δεήσεσίν μου νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, 4. [o] ἐπιποθῶν [o] σε [o] ἰδεῖν, [p] μεμνη- m 1 Thess. iii. 6.
μένος σου τῶν δακρύων, ἵνα χαρᾶς [q] πληρωθῶ, 5. [r] ὑπόμνησιν λαβὼν n Rom. i. 9, Eph. i. 16, Phil. i. 3,

1 Thess. i. 2, iii. 6, Philem. 4. o Rom. i. 11, Phil. ii. 26, 1 Thess. iii. 6. p 1 Cor. xi. 2, Matt. (3), Luke (6), John (3), Acts (2), Heb. (4, of which 3 are O.T.), 2 Pet. (1), Jude (1), Rev. (1). q Here only in Pastorals. r Ps. lxx. (lxxi.) 6, Wisd. xvi. 11, 2 Macc. vi. 17, 2 Pet. i. 13, iii. 1 only.

[l] λαμβάνων ℵ[c]DKL.

epistle is usually prefaced by St. Paul with **εὐχαριστῶ** (Rom. i. 8, 1 Cor. i. 4, Phil. i. 3, Philem. 4; **εὐχαριστοῦμεν** Col. i. 3, 1 Thess. i. 2; **οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν**, Eph. i. 16; **εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν**, 2 Thess. i. 3). A comparison of these passages makes it evident that **χάριν ἔχω** is to be connected with **ὑπόμνησιν λαβὼν, κ.τ.λ.**; **ὡς ἀδιάλειπτον—πληρωθῶ** being a parenthetical account of St. Paul's state of mind about his absent friend, while **μεμνημένος—δακρύων** is also a parenthetical clause. The thanksgiving is for the grace of God given to Timothy (*cf.* esp. 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3); and the expression of thankfulness is called forth whenever St. Paul calls him to mind, unceasingly in fact. The use of **χάριν ἔχω** in 1 Tim. i. 12 is not a parallel case to this. The phrase is quoted from the papyri by Dean Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 283.

ᾧ λατρεύω ἀπὸ προγόνων κ.τ.λ.: Two thoughts are in St. Paul's mind: (*a*) the inheritance of his religious consciousness from his forefathers, and (*b*) the continuity of the revelation of God; the same light in the New Covenant as in the Old, only far brighter.

If St. Paul had been asked, When did you first serve God? he would have answered, Even before God separated me from my mother's womb for His service. St. Paul was conscious that he was the result of generations of God-fearing people. His inborn, natural instincts were all towards the service of God. (See Acts xxii. 3, xxiv. 14; Rom. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5).

Moreover St. Paul always maintained that the Gospel was the divinely ordained sequel of Judaism; not a new religion, but the fulfilment of "the promise made of God unto our fathers" (Acts xxvi. 6; see also xxiii. 6, xxiv. 14).

ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει: Compare the claim he makes, Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 4; 2 Cor. i. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 10; and for the language here see note on 1 Tim. i. 5. **ὡς** is best rendered *as* (Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 561, where Matt. vi. 12, Gal. vi. 10 are cited in illustration). The R.V. *how* (so Alf.) implies that the cause for thankfulness is the unceasing nature of St. Paul's remembrance of Timothy; the A.V. *that* (*quod*, Vulg.) refers the cause to the remembrance itself. Rom. i. 9 is not a parallel instance of **ὡς**.

ἀδιάλειπτον—δεήσεσίν μου: A regular epistolary formula, as is evidenced by the papyri; though no doubt in St. Paul's case it corresponded to reality. See his use of it in reff. and Dean Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, pp. 37 *sq.*, 275 *sqq.* esp. p. 279, *sq.* on the formula **μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι**, from which this passage is a remarkable variation.

νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας is connected by the R.V. with **ἐπιποθῶν**. In 1 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 10, the phrase unquestionably is connected with what follows. On the other hand, in 1 Tim. v. 5 it comes at the end of a clause; and in this place the A.V. connects it with **ταῖς δεήσεσίν μου**. This is certainly right, on the analogy of 1 Thess. iii. 10, where see Milligan's note. Alf. and Ell. connect it with **ἀδιάλειπτον ἔχω**.

ἐπιποθῶν σε ἰδεῖν: a Pauline expression. See reff. **ἰδεῖν** is not expressed in 2 Cor. ix. 14, Phil. i. 8, ii. 26.

Ver. 4. **μεμνημένος—δακρύων**: Parenthetical. St. Paul's longing was made keener by his recollection of the tears Timothy had shed at their last parting. So Chrys. fixes the occasion. We are reminded of the scene at Miletus, Acts xx. 37. Bengel, comparing Acts xx. 19, thinks that reference is rather made to an habitual manifestation of strong emotion. At that time, and in that society, tears were allowed as a manifestation of emotion more freely than amongst modern men of the West.

χαρᾶς πληρωθῶ: For **πληρόω** with a genitive, *cf.* Rom. xv. 13, 14. It takes a dat., Rom. i. 29, 2 Cor. vii. 4, *cf.* Eph. v. 18; an acc., Phil. i. 11, Col. i. 9.

Ver. 5. **ὑπόμνησιν λαβών**: *Having been reminded.* Not to be connected

s See 1 Tim. i. 5. t See note. u 4 Macc. xvi. 9 only. v Rom. viii. 38, xiv. 14, xv. 14, ver. 12. w Luke viii. 47, Acts xxii. 24, 2 Tim. i. 12, Tit. i. 13, Heb. ii. 11. x 1 Cor. iv. 17. y Gen. xlv. 27, 1 Macc. xiii. 7 only.

s τῆς ἐν σοὶ [s]ἀνυποκρίτου πίστεως, ἥτις [t]ἐνῴκησεν πρῶτον ἐν τῇ [u]μάμμῃ σου Λωΐδι καὶ τῇ μητρί σου Εὐνίκῃ, [v]πέπεισμαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοί. 6. [w]δι' [w]ἣν [x]αἰτίαν [x]ἀναμιμνήσκω σε [y]ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ

with the clause immediately preceding, as R.V.m. **ὑπόμνησις**, a *reminder*, *i.e.*, an act of recollection specially excited by a particular person or thing, thus differs from **ἀνάμνησις**, which is self-originated (so Ammonius Grammaticus, quoted by Bengel). Ell. compares for the thought Eph. i. 15. For this use of **λαμβάνω**, *cf.* Rom. vii. 8, 11 (**ἀφορμὴν λ.**), Heb. ii. 3 (**ἀρχὴν λ.**), xi. 29, 36 (**πεῖραν λ.**), 2 Pet. i. 9 (**λήθην λ.**). The fact that St. Paul received this reminder of Timothy's faith suggests that there were other aspects of his conduct—possibly as an administrator—which were not wholly satisfactory. His unfeigned faith made up for much.

ἥτις ἐνῴκησεν κ.τ.λ.: **ἐνοικέω** is used in Rom. viii. 11 and 2 Tim. i. 14 of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; and in Col. iii. 16 of the Word of Christ. In 2 Cor. vi. 16, **ἐνοικήσω** is added in the quotation from Lev. xxvi. 12 to **ἐμπεριπατήσω**. Tisch. and W.H. read **ἐνοικοῦσα** for **οἰκοῦσα** in Rom. vii. 17. Timothy's faith was hereditary as St. Paul's was. **πρῶτον** does not mean that Lois was the first of her family to have faith, but that it dwelt in her, to St. Paul's knowledge, before it dwelt in Timothy. It is to be observed that it is implied that the faith of God's people before Christ came is not different in kind from faith after Christ has come.

μάμμῃ: an infantile equivalent in early Greek for **μήτηρ**, is used in later Greek for **τήθη**, *grandmother*. It occurs, *e.g.*, in 4 Macc. xvi. 9, **οὐκ ὄψομαι ὑμῶν τέκνα, οὐδὲ μάμμη κληθεῖσα μακαρισθήσομαι.** See also Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 561.

Λωΐδι: Since Timothy's father was a Greek, and his mother a Jewess (Acts xvi. 1), we may conclude that Lois was the mother of Eunice (see art. in Hastings' *D. B.*).

Εὐνίκῃ: See art. in Hastings' *D. B.*, where Lock notes that the curious reading of cursive 25 in Acts xvi. 1, **υἱὸς γυναικός τινος Ἰουδαίας χήρας**, and the substitution of **χήρας** for **Ἰουδαίας** in Gig., fuld. "may embody a tradition of her widowhood".

πέπεισμαι: The other examples of St. Paul's use of this word (see reff.) give no support to the notion of Thdrt. (followed by Alf.) that **πέπεισμαι** here has the force of our *I am sure*, *I am certain*, when we wish to hint gently that we desire reassurance on the point about which we express our certainty. In all the places in which St. Paul uses **πέπεισμαι** he is anxious to leave no doubt as to his own certitude. Nevertheless, in this case, it was quite possible for him to be perfectly certain that unfeigned faith animated Timothy, and at the same time to have misgivings (ver. 7) as to Timothy's moral courage in dealing with men. We supply **ἐνοικεῖ** after **σοί**.

Ver. 6. **δι' ἣν αἰτίαν**: not so much "because I am persuaded of thine unfeigned faith" (Theoph., Thdrt.), as, "because this faith does of a surety dwell in thee". We are most fruitfully stimulated to noble action, not when we know other people think well of us, but when their good opinion makes us recognise the gifts to us of God's grace. Faith, as well as salvation, is the gift of God, Eph. ii. 8. Except in this phrase (see reff. and Acts xxviii. 20), **αἰτία** is not found elsewhere in Paul. It is common in Matt., Mark, John, and Acts.

ἀναζωπυρεῖν: In both places cited in reff.—the only occurrences in the Greek Bible—the verb is intransitive: *his*, or *their*, *spirit revived*. Chrys. well compares with the image suggested by **ἀναζωπυρεῖν** ("stir into flame,") "quench not the Spirit," 1 Thess. v. 19, where by "the Spirit" is meant His charismatic manifestations of every kind. It is interesting to note in this connexion that **ἀναζωπυρεῖν φαντασίας** is opposed to **σβεννύναι** in M. Antoninus, vii. 2 (quoted by Wetstein).

τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ: This expression refers to the salvation of the soul by God's grace, in Rom. vi. 23, xi. 29. The narrower signification, as here, of a gift given to us to use to God's glory is **χάρισμα ἐκ θεοῦ**, 1 Cor. vii. 7, or more usually simply **χάρισμα**. The particular nature of the gift must be determined by the context. In this case it was a charisma that was exercised in a spirit not of fear-

[z]χάρισμα [z]τοῦ [z]Θεοῦ ὅ ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς [a]ἐπιθέσεως [a]τῶν [a]χειρῶν μου· 7. οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα [b]δειλίας,[1] ἀλλὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ [c]σωφρονισμοῦ. 8. Μὴ οὖν [d]ἐπαισχυνθῇς τὸ [e]μαρτύριον [f]τοῦ [f]Κυρίου [f]ἡμῶν μηδὲ ἐμὲ τὸν [g]δέσμιον αὐτοῦ·

z See 1 Tim. iv. 14, and note here.
a See 1 Tim. iv. 14.
b Here only, N.T.
c Here only, not LXX,
d Mark viii. 38=Luke ix. 26, Rom. i. 16, 2 Tim. i. 16, Heb. xi. 16, *cf.* ver. 12.
e See 1 Tim. ii. 6.
f See 1 Tim. i. 14.
g See note.

[1] **δουλείας** 238, two others, Didymus, Clem. Al., Chrys., by a confused recollection of Rom. viii. 15.

fulness. We can scarcely be wrong, then, if we suppose the charisma of administration and rule to be in St. Paul's mind rather than "the work of an evangelist" (ch. iv. 5). So Chrys., "for presiding over the Church, for the working of miracles, and for every service".

διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως—μου: See note on 1 Tim. iv. 14, where it is pointed out that we have no right to assume that hands were laid on Timothy once only. Thus Acts ix. 17 and xiii. 3 are two such occasions in St. Paul's spiritual life. There may have been others.

Ver. 7. **οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν**: The **γάρ** connects this statement with the exhortation preceding in such a way as to suggest that God's gift "to us" of a spirit of power is in the same order of being as the charisma imparted to Timothy by the laying on of St. Paul's hands. The question is, then, To whom is reference made in **ἡμῖν**? We can only reply, The Christian Society, represented by the apostles on the Day of Pentecost. (The aor. **ἔδωκεν** points to a definite occasion). Then it was that the Church began to receive the power, **δύναμις**, which had been promised (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 8) by the Lord, and realised by the apostles collectively (Acts iv. 33; 1 Cor. iv. 20, v. 4), and individually (Acts vi. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 7, xii. 9). Whatever special charismata are bestowed on the ministers of the Church at ordination, they are a part of the general stream of the Pentecostal gift which is always being poured out by the ascended Lord.

πνεῦμα δειλίας: It is simplest to take **πνεῦμα** here as a comprehensive equivalent to **χάρισμα**, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 12, **ζηλωταί ἐστε πνευμάτων**. *God did not infuse into us fearfulness*, etc. The gen. after **πνεῦμα**, in this and similar cases, Rom. viii. 15 (**δουλείας, υἱοθεσίας**), xi. 8 (**κατανύξεως**), 1 Cor. iv. 21, Gal. vi. 1 (**πραΰτητος**), 2 Cor. iv. 13 (**πίστεως**), Eph. i. 17 (**σοφίας, κ.τ.λ.**), expresses the prominent idea, the term **πνεῦμα** adds the notion that the quality spoken of is not self-originated. The personal Holy Spirit is not meant unless the context names Him unambiguously, as in Eph. i. 13.

δειλία: *fearfulness*, *timidity*, *timor*. This is the right word here, as **δουλείας** is the right word in Rom. viii. 15. It is curious that in Lev. xxvi. 36, where B has **δουλείαν** A &c. have **δειλίαν**. See *apparat. crit.* There was an element of **δειλία** in Timothy's natural disposition which must have been prejudicial to his efficiency as a Church ruler. For that position is needed (*a*) force of character, which if not natural may be inspired by consciousness of a divine appointment, (*b*) love, which is not softness, and (*c*) self-discipline, which is opposed to all easy self-indulgence which issues in laxity of administration. **σωφρονισμοῦ**: *sobrietatis*. Better active, as R.V., *discipline*, first of self, then of others. See Blass, *Grammar*, p. 61.

Vv. 8—ii. 2. The leading thoughts in this section are (*a*) the Day of reward and judgment which is surely coming (12, 18), (*b*) the unreasonableness therefore of cowardly shame (8, 12, 16), and (*c*) the necessity that Timothy should guard the deposit and hand it on (14-ii. 2).

Be not ashamed, therefore, of the Gospel to which our Lord was not ashamed to testify; nor be ashamed of me, who am in prison because of testimony borne to Him and it. Share our sufferings in the strength given by God, whose power is displayed in the Gospel of life of which I was appointed a preacher. This is the direct cause of my present lot; but I am not ashamed; for I know the power of Him to whom I have committed myself in trust. Do you imitate His faithfulness: guard the deposit committed to you. I am not asking you to do more than some others have done. You know Onesiphorus and his work as well as I do. When all turned their backs on me, he was not ashamed to make inquiries for me; and, finding me in prison, he con-

h 2 Tim. ii. 3, not LXX.
i Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11.

h ἀλλὰ συνκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ δύναμιν Θεοῦ, 9. τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ, οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν, i ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν [1] πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ

stantly cheered me by his visits. May God bless him and his! Do you, then, welcome the strengthening grace of Christ, and provide for a succession of faithful teachers to preserve intact the sacred deposit of the faith.

Ver. 8. **μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῇς**: The Saying of Jesus (Mark viii. 38=Luke ix. 26) was probably in St. Paul's mind. He alludes to it again, ii. 12. The aor. subj. with **μὴ** forbids the supposition that Timothy had actually done what St. Paul warns him against doing (Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 628, and J. H. Moulton, *Grammar*, vol. i. p. 122 *sq.*). See note on 1 Tim. iv. 14. Personal appeals are a feature of this epistle *cf.* ver. 13, ii. 3, 15, iii. 14, iv. 1, 2, 5.

τὸ μαρτύριον τ. Κυρίου: *Testimony borne by our Lord*, His words, His ethical and spiritual teaching, by which Christianity has influenced the ideals and practice of society. The gen. after **μαρτύριον** is best taken as subjective. See 1 Cor. i. 6, ii. 1; 2 Thess. i. 10.

τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 14.

ἐμὲ τὸν δέσμιον αὐτοῦ: This does not mean *one made prisoner by the Lord*, but *one who belongs to the Lord and is a prisoner for His sake*. There is nothing figurative about **δέσμιος**. St. Paul calls himself **ὁ δέσμ. τ. Χρ. Ἰησ.** in Eph. iii. 1, **δέσμ. Χρ. Ἰησ.** Philem. 1 and 9. The idea is more clearly expressed in **ὁ δέσμ. ἐν Κυρίῳ** Eph. iv. 1. He is a prisoner; he is also "in Christ". The expression also suggests the thought that his earthly imprisonment is ordered by the Lord, not by man. The present captivity is alluded to again in ver. 16 and ii. 9. It is not the same figure as in 2 Cor. ii. 14, "God which always leadeth us in triumph in Christ" as His captives. See Lightfoot on Col. ii. 15.

συνκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ: *Join us* [*the Lord and me*] *in our sufferings for the Gospel's sake.* More than once in this epistle St. Paul declares that he is suffering (**πάσχω**, ver. 12; **κακοπαθῶ**, ii. 9). He has said, "Be not ashamed . . . of me"; but he has just coupled the testimony of the Lord with his own; and further on (ii. 8) Jesus Christ is noted as the great illustration of the law, "No cross, no crown". See note there. It is best then to give a wider reference than **μοι** to the **συν** in **συνκακοπάθ.** The R.V., *Suffer hardship with the gospel* is needlessly harsh. The dat. **τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ** is the *dativus commodi*.

κατὰ δύναμιν θεοῦ must be connected with **συνκακοπάθ.**; and this suggests that the power of God here means *power given by God*, as in 2 Cor. vi. 7, 1 Pet. i. 5, "the power that worketh in us" (Eph. iii. 20), the assured possession of which would brace Timothy to suffer hardship. Alf. and Ell., following Bengel, take it subjectively: *the power of God displayed in our salvation* (as in Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18, 24, ii. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 4). But St. Paul could scarcely exhort Timothy to display a degree of fortitude comparable to God's active power. The next verse, **τοῦ σώσαντος, κ.τ.λ.**, is not a detailed description of God's power to save, but a recalling of the fact that Timothy had actually experienced God's saving grace in the past. This consideration would stimulate Timothy to play the man.

Ver. 9. **τοῦ σώσαντος, κ.τ.λ.**: The connexion, as has been just remarked, is that our recognition at our baptism of God's saving and calling grace—He saved us and called us at a definite point of time (aor.)—ought to strengthen our faith in the continuance in the future of His gifts of power to us. On the insistence in this group of epistles on God's saving grace, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 4.

καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ: *To a holy calling, i.e.*, to a life of holiness, is less ambiguous than *with a holy calling*, which might mean "a calling uttered by a Holy One," or "in holy language". **κλῆσις** does not here mean *the invitation* (as in Rom. xi. 29), but, when qualified as here by an adj., it means the condition into which, or the purpose for which, we have been called (so **ἡ ἄνω κλ.**, Phil. iii. 14, **ἐπουράνιος κλ.**, Heb. iii. 1; and *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 20). We have been "called to be saints," Rom. i. 7, "called into the fellowship of God's Son," 1 Cor. i. 9.

οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα: The sentiment is more clearly expressed in Tit. iii. 5, **οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων . . . ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς.** There is an echo in both places of the controversy, now over, concerning works and grace. Perhaps **κατά** is used in this

[a]Ἰησοῦ [k]πρὸ [k]χρόνων [k]αἰωνίων, 10. [l]φανερωθεῖσαν δὲ νῦν διὰ τῆς [m]ἐπιφανείας [n]τοῦ [n]σωτῆρος [n]ἡμῶν [n]Χριστοῦ [n]Ἰησοῦ,[1] [o]καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν [o]θάνατον [p]φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ [q]ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 11. [r]εἰς [r]ὃ [r]ἐτέθην [r]ἐγὼ [r]κῆρυξ [r]καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ [r]διδάσκαλος.[2] 12. [s]δι' [s]ἣν [s]αἰτίαν καὶ ταῦτα [t]πάσχω· ἀλλ' οὐκ [u]ἐπαισχύνομαι· οἶδα γὰρ ᾧ πεπίστευκα, καὶ [v]πέπεισμαι ὅτι [w]δυνατός [w]ἐστιν τὴν [x]παραθήκην μου [x]φυλάξαι εἰς [y]ἐκείνην [y]τὴν

k Tit. i. 2, *cf.* Rom. xvi. 25.
l See note on 1 Tim. iii. 16.
m See 1 Tim. vi. 14.
n Tit. i. 4, ii. 13, iii. 6 (?).
o 1 Cor. xv. 26, Heb. ii. 14.
p 1 Cor. iv. 5, Eph. iii. 9.
q Wisd. (2), 4 Macc. (2), Rom. ii. 7, 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 53, 54, Eph. vi. 24.
r See 1 Tim. ii. 7.
s See ver. 6.
t Here only in Pastorals.
u Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 6, *cf.* ver. 8.
v See ver. 5.
w Luke xiv. 31, Rom. iv. 21, xi. 23, Tit. i. 9, *cf.* Heb. xi. 19, Jas. iii. 2.
x See 1 Tim. vi. 20.
y 2 Thess. i. 10, 2 Tim. i. 18, iv. 8.

[1] So ℵ*AD*, d, e, sah.; Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵcCDcFGKLP, all cursives, f, g, vg., go., boh., syrr., arm.

[2] Add ἐθνῶν (from 1 Tim. ii. 7), all except ℵ*A, 17.

clause to mark more vividly the antithesis to the next, **κατὰ ἰδ. πρόθ.**, in which its use is more normal. See Eph. ii. 8, **οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον.**

ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν, κ.τ.λ.: The grace in which the divine purpose for man expresses itself was given to mankind before times eternal; mankind, sons of God, being summed up, concentrated, in the Son of God, whom we know now as Christ Jesus. In Him was present, germ-wise, redeemed humanity, to be realised in races and individuals in succeeding ages.

We have here the same teaching about the Church and Christ as is more fully given in Ephesians and Colossians (see especially Eph. i. 4). In Rom. xvi. 25 the antithesis between a reality veiled in the past and now unveiled, or manifested, is expressed in language very similar to that of the passage before us: **κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν.**

πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων: expresses the notion of that which is anterior to the most remote period in the past conceivable by any imagination that man knows of.

Ver. 10. **φανερωθεῖσαν**: See note on 1 Tim. iii. 16. Bengel calls attention to the fit juxtaposition of *illustria verba*: **φανερωθεῖσαν, ἐπιφανείας, φωτίσαντος.**

διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας, κ.τ.λ.: See on 1 Tim. vi. 14. The **ἐπιφάνεια** here must not be referred to the Incarnation, considered as having taken place at a particular moment in time. It includes it; the **ἐπιφάνεια** began then; and will be continued, becoming ever brighter and clearer, until its consummation, to which the term **ἐπιφάνεια** is elsewhere restricted.

καταργήσαντος: We cannot, because of the absence of an article before the participles, safely translate, *when he brought to nought*, rather than, *who brought to nought. Abolished* does not express the truth. Christians all "taste of death" as their Master did (John viii. 52, Heb. ii. 9), though they do not "see" it; and they are confident that they too will be "saved out of death" (Heb. v. 7). Death for them has lost its sting (Heb. ii. 14, 15). It need not cause any difficulty that here the undoing of death is spoken of as past, whereas in 1 Cor. xv. 26, 54, it is "the last enemy that shall be abolished" (see Rev. xx. 14). We have a parallel in John xvi. 11, "The prince of this world hath been judged".

τὸν θάνατον: Alf., following Bengel, sees a special force in the art. - "as if he had said *Orcum illum*".

φωτίσαντος: To be connected with **διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.** The Gospel is that by which the presence of Christ, the light, is apprehended. That light does not create life and incorruption: it displays them.

ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν: *Immortality* or *Incorruption* defines the *life* more clearly.

Ver. 11. **εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην, κ.τ.λ.**: See 1 Tim. ii. 7, where these words are also found, and the note on 1 Tim. i. 11.

Ver. 12. **δι' ἣν αἰτίαν**: *i.e.*, because I am a preacher of the Gospel. *Cf.* Gal. v. 11.

οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι: *Non confundor. I am not disappointed of my hope*, as in ref.

πεπίστευκα . . . πέπεισμαι: The perfects have their usual force. For **πέπεισμαι** see Rom. viii. 38 and note on ver. 5.

τὴν παραθήκην μου is best taken as *that which I have deposited for safe*

z See 1 Tim. i. 16.
a See 1 Tim. vi. 3.
b 1 Tim. i. 14.
c See 1 Tim. vi. 20.
d See 1 Tim. v. 21.
e Rom. viii. 11.
f Matt. v. 42, 2 Tim. iv. 4, Tit. i. 14, Heb. xii. 25.

z ἣν ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε a ὑγιαινόντων a λόγων ὧν παρ' i. 16. a See 1 Tim. ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας ἐν b πίστει b καὶ b ἀγάπῃ b τῇ b ἐν b Χριστῷ b Ἰησοῦ. vi. 3. b 1 Tim. i. 14. τὴν καλὴν c παραθήκην[1] c d φύλαξον διὰ Πνεύματος e Ἁγίου τοῦ c See 1 Tim. e ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν. 15. Οἶδας τοῦτο ὅτι f ἀπεστράφησάν με vi. 20. d See 1 Tim. v. 21. e Rom. viii. 11. f Matt. v. 42, 2 Tim. iv. 4, Tit. i. 14, Heb. xii. 25.

[1] παρακαταθήκην 47, many others.

keeping. *Cf.* the story of St. John and the robber from Clem. Alex. *Quis Dives*, § 42, quoted by Eus. *H. E.* iii. 23, **τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἀπόδος ἡμῖν.** Here it means "my soul" or "myself," *cf.* Ps. xxx. (xxxi.) 6, **εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου,** Luke xxiii. 46, 1 Pet. iv. 19, 1 Thess. v. 23. This explanation of **παραθήκην** harmonises best with **ἐπαισχύνομαι, πεπίστευκα,** and **φυλάξαι.** The whole verse has a purely personal reference. Nothing but a desire to give **παραθήκη** the same meaning wherever it occurs (1 Tim. vi. 20, *q.v.*; 2 Tim. i. 14) could have made Chrys. explain it here as "the faith, the preaching of the Gospel". So R.V.m., *that which he hath committed unto me.* "Paulus, decessui proximus, duo deposita habebat: alterum Domino, alterum Timotheo committendum," Bengel. This exegesis compels us to refer ᾧ to God the Father.

εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν: The day of judgment and award, 1 Cor. iii. 13.

Ver. 13. **ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε**: A resumption of the exhortation which was broken off in ver. 9. This command is strictly parallel to that which follows: **ὑποτ. ὑγιαιν.**—**ἤκουσας** corresponds to, and is the external expression of, **τὴν καλ. παραθήκην**; **ἔχε** corresponds to **φύλαξον**; and **ἐν πίστει**—**Ἰησοῦ** to **διὰ**—**ἡμῖν.**

ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαινόντων λόγων: The gen. is that of apposition: *a pattern, sc.* of faith, *expressed in sound words.* The phrase marks an advance on the **μόρφωσις τῆς γνώσεως** (Rom. ii. 20) or **μόρφ. εὐσεβείας** (2 Tim. iii. 5). It happily suggests the power of expansion latent in the simplest and most primitive dogmatic formulas of the Christian faith.

ἔχε has the same strengthened signification as in 1 Tim. i. 19, where see note.

ὑγιαινόντων λόγων: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ὧν . . . ἤκουσας: Alf. notes that the use of **ὧν** rather than **ἧν** shows that **ὑγιαιν. λόγ.** and not **ὑποτύπ.** is the chief thing in St. Paul's mind. It is obvious that Timothy could not have *heard* the **ὑποτύπωσις,** which is a concept of the mind expressed in many sound words heard on various occasions. As to the translation, von Soden agrees with Hort, who insists on "the order, the absence of **τὴν,** and the use of **ἔχε**" as compelling us to render, "Hold as a pattern," etc. This rendering would favour Hort's conjecture that "ΩΝ is a primitive corruption for ON," *i.e.*, "Hold as a pattern of sound words the word which thou hast heard," etc. But the absence of the article is such a marked feature in the Pastorals that no argument can be based on it here.

Bengel calls attention to the change in order in ii. 2. Here, **παρ' ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας,** the emphasis being on St. Paul's personal authority; there, **ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ,** because of the antithesis between **ἤκουσας** and **παράθου.**

ἐν πίστει, κ.τ.λ.: See note on 1 Tim. i. 14. This clause must be joined with **ἔχε,** not with **ἤκουσας,** nor with **ὑγιαιν. λόγ.** only: *as given in faith,* etc. (von Soden),

Ver. 14. **τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην**: The faith, which is a **ὑποτύπωσις** in relation to the growing apprehension of it by the Church, is a **παραθήκη,** *deposit*, in the case of each individual. On the constant epithet **καλός** see 1 Tim. i. 18, and on **παραθήκη** 1 Tim. vi. 20. There is a special force in **καλήν** here, as distinguishing the precious faith from **τὴν παραθήκην μου** of ver. 12.

φύλαξον διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου: φυλάσσειν is more than **ἔχειν**: it implies here final perseverance; and that can only be attained through the Holy Spirit. God must co-operate with man, if man's efforts are to be successful. *Cf.* "Work out your own salvation . . . for it is God which worketh in you" (Phil. ii. 12, 13).

Πνεύματος Ἁγίου: This verse and Tit. iii. 5 are the only places in the Pastorals in which the Holy Spirit is mentioned.

Ver. 15. **οἶδας τοῦτο**: There is a personal appeal for loyalty in this reminder. The whole paragraph, with its examples cited of disloyalty and loyalty, was intended as an object lesson to Timothy.

πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· ὧν ἐστὶν Φύγελος καὶ Ἑρμογένης. 16. [g] δῴη g Deut. xiii. 17 (18), Josh. xi. 20, Isa. xlvii. 6, Jer. xvi. 13, xlix. (xlii.) 12, Mic. vii. 20. h Here only, N.T. i Eph. vi. 20. k See ver. 8. l Luke vii. 4, Phil. ii. 28, Tit. iii. 13.
ἔλεος ὁ Κύριος τῷ Ὀνησιφόρου οἴκῳ· ὅτι πολλάκις με [h] ἀνέψυξεν καὶ τὴν [i] ἅλυσίν μου οὐκ [k] ἐπαισχύνθη,[1] 17. ἀλλὰ γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ [l] σπουδαίως[2] ἐζήτησέν με καὶ εὗρεν·—18. δῴη αὐτῷ ὁ

[1] ἐπησχύνθη ℵ*K. [2] σπουδαιότερον DcKL; σπουδαιότερως A, two cursives.

ἀπεστράφησάν με: The reff., with the exception of chap. iv. 4, are parallel to this use of the verb.

πάντες must not be pressed: it is the sweeping assertion of depression. If it had been even approximately true, Timothy would have had no church to administer. On the other hand, something less serious than apostasy from the faith may be alluded to, such as personal neglect of the apostle (*cf.* iv. 16, **πάντες με ἐγκατέλειπον**, and the contrast of Onesiphorus' conduct with theirs in the next verse), a thing which to us who see St. Paul through the halo of centuries of veneration seems painfully hard to understand. But it is abundantly plain that apostles did not during their lifetime receive that universal and unquestioning reverence from their fellow-Christians which we would have antecedently supposed could not have been withheld from them. *Cf.* 3 John 9.

οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ: Asia means the Roman province, which included Mysia, Lydia, Caria, great part of Phrygia, the Troad, and the islands off the coast.

This statement is most naturally explained of a defection in Asia of natives of Asia. Plummer conjectures that St. Paul had applied by letter from Rome for help to some leading Asiatic Christians, and had been refused. Of course it is possible that St. Paul refers to something that had taken place in Rome (so Bengel, who compares chap. iv. 16). But *all who are in Asia* would be a strange way of referring to some Asiastics who had been in Rome and had returned to Asia; and though **οἶδας τοῦτο** is naturally understood as mentioning something of which Timothy had knowledge only by report, we cannot be sure that St. Paul intended here to distinguish **οἶδας** from **γινώσκεις**. Perhaps the defection had taken place during an absence of Timothy from Asia. Nothing else is known certainly of Phygelus and Hermogenes.

Ver. 16. **δῴη ἔλεος, κ.τ.λ.**: **δίδωμι ἔλεος**, like **εὑρίσκω ἔλεος**, is a Hebraism. See reff. The correlative, **λαμβάνω ἔλεος** occurs Heb. iv. 6. **ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετά τινος** (Luke i. 72, x. 37; Jas. ii. 13) is a similar phrase. Here, we should say, *May God bless so and so.* **ἔλεος** does not correspond to any special sin.

τῷ Ὀν. οἴκῳ: This household is saluted in iv. 19. It is most natural to suppose that Onesiphorus himself was dead, both from this expression and from the pious wish in ver. 18. Prayer for living friends is normally and naturally in regard to objects which will be realised here in earth. The evidence of 2 Macc. xii. 44, 45, proves that an orthodox Jew of our Lord's time could have prayed for the dead. A full discussion of the question must embrace a consideration of the final cause of prayer, and of the nature of that which we call death. See reff. to recent literature on this subject in Milligan's art. *Onesiphorus* in Hastings' *D. B.*

ἀνέψυξεν: The comprehensive term *refresh* expresses the notion admirably. They are "the blessed of God the Father" to whom the King shall say, "I was in prison, and ye came unto me" (Matt. xxv. 36. See Heb. x. 34, xiii. 3). For St. Paul's appreciation of the pleasures of friendly intercourse, see Rom. xv. 32, 1 Cor. xvi. 18, 2 Cor. vii. 13, Philem. 7, 20.

ἐπαισχύνθη: For other examples of the absence of the temporal augment *cf.* Luke xiii. 13 (**ἀνορθώθη** A B D, etc.); xxiv. 27, John vi. 18, Acts ii. 25, Rom. ix. 29 (**ὁμοιώθημεν** A F G L P).

Ver. 17. **γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ**: The reference is most likely to the apostle's first Roman imprisonment, Eph. vi. 20. Whichever it was, **πολλάκις** implies that it had lasted some time.

Ver. 18. It is immaterial whether we explain **ὁ Κύριος**, in this verse, of God the Father, the source of judgment, or of God the Son, the instrument of judgment. It is far-fetched to suppose that the repeated **Κύριος . . . Κυρίου** refer to different divine Persons. Huther's expl., followed by Alf., seems the best, that **δῴη ὁ Κύριος** had become so completely a for-

m Gen. xix. 19, Num. xi. 15, Judg. vi. 17, Dan. LXX, iii. 39 (TH. iii. 38), ix. 3.
n See ver. 12.

m κύριος m εὑρεῖν m ἔλεος παρὰ κυρίου l ἐν n ἐκείνῃ n τῇ n ἡμέρᾳ—καὶ ὅσα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ o διηκόνησεν, βέλτιον σὺ γινώσκεις.

II. 1. Σὺ οὖν, a τέκνον μου, b ἐνδυναμοῦ ἐν τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· 2. καὶ ἃ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων ταῦτα c παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις οἵτινες d ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ

o 1 Pet. i. 12, iv. 10, with acc. a See 1 Tim. i. 2. b See 1 Tim. i. 12. c See 1 Tim. i. 18.
d 1 Cor. xv. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 5.

l θεῷ D*, d, e.

mula that the recurrence did not seem harsh.

καὶ ὅσα κ.τ.λ.: This clause is an afterthought.

διηκόνησεν: The verb is used with a perfectly general reference here, as in Heb. vi. 10.

βέλτιον: The comparative here is intensive or elative. See Blass, *Grammar*, pp. 33, 141, 142. Other examples are in 1 Tim. iii. 14 (Tisch.) and in the Received Text of ver. 17 of this chapter.

CHAPTER II.—Ver. 1. **σύ**: emphatic, as in 1 Tim. vi. 11 and ch. iii. 10; but the appeal is not primarily that Timothy should imitate Onesiphorus, or learn by the example of Phygelus and Hermogenes, but rather marks the intensity of the apostle's anxiety for the future conduct of Timothy in the Church; and similarly **οὖν** is resumptive of all the considerations and appeals for loyalty in chap. i.

τέκνον: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2.

ἐνδυναμοῦ ἐν, κ.τ.λ.: The thought is resumed from i. 8, 9, and expanded in vv. 3-13. The closest parallel is that in Eph. vi. 10, **ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν Κυρίῳ, κ.τ.λ.** See note on 1 Tim. i. 12 and reff., esp. Rom. iv. 20, Phil. iv. 13. Although the verb is passive, as indicated in the R.V., those who are, or who are exhorted to be, strengthened are not merely passive recipients of an influence from without. The act of reception involves man's co-operation with God. Compare "Abide in me, and I in you" (John xv. 4). The perfection of God's power is conditioned by the weakness of man (2 Cor. xii. 9).

τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.: The two passages, 2 Cor. xii. 9, and Eph. vi. 10, alluded to in the last note, explain this. *Grace* here has its simplest theological meaning, as the divine help, the unmerited gift of assistance that comes from God.

Ver. 2. St. Paul is here contemplating an apostolical succession in respect of teaching rather than of administration. It is natural that in the circumstances of the primitive Church the building up of converts in the faith should have occupied a larger place in the Christian consciousness than the functions of an official ministry; but the historical continuity of the ministry of order is of course involved in the direction here. St. Paul would have been surprised if any other conclusion had been drawn from his words. In any case, the Providence of God sees further than do His servants.

ἃ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ: See note on i. 13.

διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων: not *per multos testes* (Vulg.), but *coram multis testibus* (Tert. *de Praescript.* 25). The usual Greek for "in the presence of witnesses" is **ἐπὶ μαρτύρων**; but **διὰ θεῶν μαρτύρων** is quoted from Plutarch (see Field, *in loc.*).

The **διὰ** is that of accompanying circumstances. The reference is to a solemn *traditio* of the essentials of the faith on the occasion of Timothy's ordination, rather than his baptism. The former reference seems clear from the parallel drawn between St. Paul's committal of the faith to Timothy and Timothy's committal of it to others. On the other hand, a comparison of 1 Tim. vi. 12 favours the view that this refers to a formal public instruction at baptism. Reasons have been already suggested against the identification of the laying-on of hands of 1 Tim. iv. 14 with that of 2 Tim. i. 6. Otherwise it would be natural to suppose that the *many witnesses* were the members of the presbytery who were joined with St. Paul in the ordination of Timothy. But there is no reason why the reference should be thus restricted. The action was a public one, "in the face of the Church". So Chrys., "Thou hast not heard in secret, nor apart, but in the presence of many, with all openness of speech". The view of Clem. Alex.

ἑτέρους διδάξαι. 3. [e]Συνκακοπάθησον[1] ὡς καλὸς [f]στρατιώτης Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.[2] 4. οὐδεὶς [g]στρατευόμενος [h]ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ [i]βίου [k]πραγματίαις, ἵνα τῷ [l]στρατολογήσαντι ἀρέσῃ. 5. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ [m]ἀθλῇ τις, οὐ [n]στεφανοῦται ἐὰν μὴ [o]νομίμως [m]ἀθλήσῃ. 6. τὸν κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν δεῖ πρῶτον τῶν καρπῶν [p]μεταλαμβάνειν.

e See 2 Tim. i. 8.
f Here only in Paul.
g See 1 Tim. i. 18.
h 2 Pet. ii. 20 only, N.T.
i See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
k Here only, N.T. ii. 7, 9 only, N.T.
l Here only, not LXX.
o See 1 Tim. i. 8.
m Here only, not LXX, *cf.* Heb. x. 32.
p Acts. ii. 26, xxvii. 33, 34, Heb. vi. 7, xii. 10.
n Heb.

[1] **σὺ οὖν κακοπάθ.** CcDcKL, syrhcl-txt, go. [2] **Ἰησ. Χριστ.** DcKL, syrpesh.

(*Hypot.* vii. ed. Potter, ii. p. 1015) that the **πολλοὶ μάρτυρες** mean testimonies from the Law and the Prophets is only a curiosity of exegesis.

παράθου: See note on 1 Tim. 18.

πιστοῖς: *trustworthy*, carries on the figure of the faith as a deposit. It is possible, as Bengel suggests, that the injunctions in vv. 14-21 have reference to these ministers.

ἱκανοί: *qualified*. See reff. **δυνατός**, in Tit. i. 9, expresses capability as proved by experience.

Vv. 3-13. The condition of all success is toil; toil which may involve pain. Think of the price of a soldier's victory, the conditions of an athlete's crown, of a field-labourer's wage. Our Lord Jesus Himself, as man, is the great Exemplar of this law. I am another. This is a faithful saying; and therefore we sing, "We shall live with Him because we died with Him, etc.".

Ver. 3. **συνκακοπάθησον**: *Take thy part in suffering hardship* (R.V.m.). This general reference is better than to supply **μοι**, as R.V. See note on i. 8. **στρατιώτης**: *cf.* **συνστρατιώτης**, Phil. ii. 25, Philem. 2.

Ver. 4. **στρατευόμενος**: *militans Deo* (Vulg.). *Soldier*, in the sense of a person belonging to the army, not *soldier on service*, as R.V., which makes the same error in Luke iii. 14 marg. (See *Expositor*, vi., vii. 120).

ἐμπλέκεται: *implicat se* (Vulg.). The verb is used in a similar metaphor, 2 Pet. ii. 20, but in a more adverse sense than here. A soldier, who is bound to go anywhere and do any thing at the bidding of his captain, must have no ties of home or business. The implied counsel is the same as that given in 1 Cor. vii. 26-34, with its warnings against distraction between the possibly conflicting interests of the Lord and of this life. Note the use of **ἀρέσκω** in 1 Cor. vii. 32-34.

ἀρέσῃ: *that he may be of use to* (see Milligan on 1 Thess. ii. 4).

Ver. 5. The sequence of images here—the soldier, the athlete, the field-labourer—affords an interesting illustration of repetition due to association of ideas. The soldier and the field-labourer are combined in 1 Cor. ix. 7-10; the athlete appears in 1 Cor. ix. 24 *sqq*. And the present passage has light thrown upon it from the earlier epistle, in which the various figures are more fully developed.

The connexion between the thought of the soldier and the athlete lies in the word **νομίμως** (see note on 1 Tim. i. 8); and the exact force of **νομίμως** will appear from a reference to 1 Cor. ix. 25, "Every man that striveth in the games is temperate in all things". No one can be said to comply with the rules of the contest who has not undergone the usual preliminary training. One illustration from those cited by Wetstein will suffice, that from Galen, *comm. in Hippocr.* i. 15: **οἱ γυμνασταὶ καὶ οἱ νομίμως ἀθλοῦντες, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀρίστου τὸν ἄρτον μόνον ἐσθίουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δείπνου τὸ κρέας.**

Ver. 6. The difficulty in this verse is that the principle here laid down seems to be employed in 1 Cor. ix, 7, 9, as an argument from analogy in support of the liberty of Christian ministers to enjoy some temporal profit from their spiritual labours; whereas here St. Paul is urging a temper of other-worldliness. It is sufficient to say that there is no practical inconsistency between the two passages; "each man hath his own gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that". There is a time to insist on one's liberty to "use the world," and there is a time to warn ourselves and others that self-repression is necessary to keep ourselves from "using it to the full". The main connexion here lies in the word **κοπιῶντα**, which is emphatic; while **πρῶτον**,

q Mark xii. 33, Luke ii. 47, 1 Cor. i. 19, Eph. iii. 4, Col. i. 9, ii. 2. r Matt. xvi. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 9, Rev. xviii. 5 (with acc.). s Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25. t Jonah iv. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 5, Jas. v. 13, only. u Acts xx. 23, xxvi. 29, Phil. i. 7, 13, 14, 17, Col. iv. 18, Philem. 10, 13. v Luke xxiii. 32, 33, 39.

7. νόει ὃ[1] λέγω· δώσει[2] γάρ σοι ὁ Κύριος [q]σύνεσιν ἐν πᾶσιν. 8. [r]μνημόνευε [r]Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐγηγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ, [s]κατὰ [s]τὸ [s]εὐαγγέλιόν [s]μου· 9. ἐν ᾧ [t]κακοπαθῶ μέχρι [u]δεσμῶν ὡς [v]κακοῦργος· ἀλλὰ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ δέδεται.

[1] So ℵ*ACFgrGP, 17, g go., syrpesh; ἃ ℵcDKL, d, e, f, vg., boh., syrhcl, arm.
[2] δῴη CcKLP.

which is also emphatic, expresses in the illustration from the **γεωργός** the idea corresponding to **τῷ στρατ. ἀρέσῃ**, and to **στεφανοῦται** in the others respectively. The labourer receives his hire, no matter how poor the crop may be: his wages are the first charge on the field. *Cf.* **γῆ . . . τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὔθετον ἐκείνοις δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται** (Heb. vi. 7); his reward is sure, but then he must really labour. "The fruits" are the reward of faithful labour in the Lord's vineyard, the "well done!" heard from the Captain's lips, "the crown of glory that fadeth not away". We must not press all the details of an allegory.

Ver. 7. **νόει ὃ λέγω**: *Intellige quae dico* (Vulg.), *Grasp the meaning*, cautionary and encouraging, of these three similes. *Cf.* "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say" (1 Cor. x. 15), and the use of the verb in 1 Tim. i. 7.

δώσει, κ.τ.λ.: If you have not sufficient wisdom to follow my argument, "ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally" (Jas. i. 5).

μνημόνευε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν—Δαυείδ: These words form rather the conclusion of the preceding paragraph than the beginning of a new one. St. Paul in pressing home his lesson, passes from figures of speech to the great concrete example of suffering followed by glory. And as he has, immediately before, been laying stress on the certainty of reward, he gives a prominent place to **ἐγηγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν**. Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, "Himself man" (1 Tim. ii. 5), is the ideal soldier, athlete, and field-labourer; yet One who can be an example to us. It is not the resurrection as a doctrinal fact (A.V.) that St. Paul has in mind, but the resurrection as a personal experience of Jesus Christ, the reward He received, His being "crowned with glory and honour, because of the suffering of death" (Heb. ii. 9). It is not **τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν** (Acts xvii. 18), but **Ἰησοῦν ἐγηγερμένον**, the perfect (as in 1 Cor. xv. 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20) preserving the notion of the permanent significance of that personal experience of Jesus. In the other passage, Rom. i. 3, in which St. Paul distinctly alludes to our Lord's human ancestry, the phrase **τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ** has a directly historical and polemical intention, as expressing and emphasising the human nature of Christ in antithesis to His Divinity. Here **ἐκ σπερμ. Δ.** merely expresses the fact of His humanity. We cannot affirm with certainty that the phrase has the Messianic import that *Son of David* has in the Gospels.

κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου: *The Gospel preached by me.* See reff., and **τὸ εὐ. τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ** (Gal. i. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 1), which of course is identical in substance with **τὸ εὐ. . . . ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ** (1 Tim. i. 11). The verity both of Christ's humanity and of His resurrection was emphasised in the Gospel preached by St. Paul. This is brought out by the punctuation of R.V.

Ver. 9. **ἐν ᾧ κακοπαθῶ**: *in which sphere of action, cf.* Rom. i. 9, 2 Cor. x. 14, Phil. iv. 2. The connexion seems to be that St. Paul is now indicating that he himself, in his degree, is an imitator of Jesus Christ.

ὡς κακοῦργος (see reff.): *malefactor* (R.V.). *Evil doer* (A.V.) does not so vividly express the notion of criminality implied in the word. Ramsay notes that the use of this word here marks "exactly the tone of the Neronian period, and . . . refers expressly to the *flagitia*, for which the Christians were condemned under Nero, and for which they were no longer condemned in A.D. 112" (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 249). Compare 1 Pet. iv. 15.

ἀλλὰ—οὐ δέδεται: We have the same contrast between the apostle's own restricted liberty and the unconfinable range of the Gospel in Phil. i. 12, 14, and 2 Tim. iv. 17. There is no reference, as

10. διὰ τοῦτο πάντα ὑπομένω διὰ τοὺς [w]ἐκλεκτούς, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ σωτηρίας [x]τύχωσιν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ [3]Ἰησοῦ μετὰ [y]δόξης [y]αἰωνίου.[1]
11. [z]πιστὸς [z]ὁ [z]λόγος· εἰ γὰρ [a]συναπεθάνομεν, καὶ [b]συζήσομεν·
12. εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ [c]συνβασιλεύσομεν· εἰ [d]ἀρνησόμεθα,[2] κἀκεῖνος

w See note.
x Luke xx. 35, Acts xxiv. 3, xxvi. 22, xxvii. 3, Heb. viii. 6, xi. 35.
y 1 Pet. v. 10.
z See 1 Tim. i. 15. 2 Cor. vii. 3, not LXX.
a Ecclus. xix. 10, Mark xiv. 31, 2 Cor. vii. 3 only.
b Rom. vi. 8, c 1 Esd. viii. 26, 1 Cor. iv. 8 only.
d See 1 Tim. v. 8.

[1] οὐρανίου f, vg., syrhcl-mg, arm.

[2] ἀρνούμεθα ℵcDKLP, d, e.

Chrys. supposes, to the liberty permitted to St. Paul to preach the kingdom of God in his prison, as during the first imprisonment (Acts xxviii. 30, 31). The clause here is a natural reflective parenthetical remark.

Ver. 10. **διὰ τοῦτο**: The knowledge that others had been, and were being, saved through his ministry was regarded by St. Paul as no small part of his reward. Thus, the Churches of Macedonia were his "crown," as well as his "joy" (Phil. iv. 1, 1 Thess. ii. 19). He had already in sight his "crown of righteousness". This consideration suggests that we should refer **διὰ τοῦτο** to what follows rather than to what immediately precedes (**ὁ λόγος . . . δέδεται**). So Alf., who cites in illustration Rom. iv. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 10, 1 Tim. i. 16, Philem 15. On this view, we have completely displayed the conformity of Jesus Christ and of St. Paul to the conditions of success exemplified in the soldier, the athlete, and the field-labourer.

πάντα ὑπομένω: as Love does, 1 Cor. xiii. 7. Ellicott rightly points out that Christian endurance is active, not passive: pain is felt as pain, but is recognised as having a moral and spiritual purpose.

διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς: St. Paul was much sustained by the thought that his labours and sufferings were, in the providence of God, beneficial to others (2 Cor. i. 6, xii. 15; Eph. iii. 1, 13; Phil. ii. 17; Col. i. 24; Tit. i. 1). "The elect" are those who, in the providence of God's grace, are selected for spiritual privileges with a view directly to the salvation of others, as well as of themselves. The absolute phrase as here is found in Matt. xxiv. 22, 24 = Mark xiii. 20, 22; **οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ αὐτοῦ** in Matt. xxiv. 31 = Mark xiii. 27 (?), Luke xviii. 7; **ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ** in Rom. viii. 33, Col. iii. 12, Tit. i. 1; **ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς ἐν Κυρίῳ** in Rom. xvi. 13.

καὶ αὐτοί: *they also* (as well as I). It would be no Paradise to St. Paul "to live in Paradise alone". Compare his supreme expression of selflessness in Rom. ix. 3.

σωτηρίας μετὰ δόξης αἰωνίου: Salvation may be enjoyed in part in this life; it will be consummated in eternal glory. See ref., and 2 Cor. iv. 17.

Ver. 11. **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος**: The teaching or saying referred to is "the word of the cross" as set forth by simile and living example in the preceding verses, 4-11. So R.V.m. This is an exactly parallel case to 1 Tim. iv. 9. Here, as there, **γάρ** introduces a reinforcement of the teaching.

εἰ γὰρ συναπεθάνομεν, κ.τ.λ.: The presence of **γάρ** does not militate against the supposition that we have here a fragment of a Christian hymn. A quotation adduced in the course of an argument must be introduced by some inferential particle; see on 1 Tim. iv. 10. On the other hand, it is questionable if **εἰ ἀρνησόμεθα, κ.τ.λ.** is suitable in tone to a hymn; and St. Paul's prose constantly rises to rhythmical cadences, *e.g.*, Rom. viii. 33 *sqq.*, 1 Cor. xiii. We have here contrasted two crises, and two states in the spiritual life: **συναπεθάνομεν** and **ἀρνησόμεθα** point to definite acts at definite times; while **ὑπομένομεν** and **ἀπιστοῦμεν** indicate states of being, more or less prolonged.

εἰ συναπεθάνομεν καὶ συνζήσομεν: The two verbs are coupled also in 2 Cor. vii. 3; but the actual parallel in thought is found in Rom. vi. 4, 5, 8. *We died* (aor., R.V.) with Christ at our baptism (Rom. vi. 8; Col. iii. 3), which, as normally administered by immersion, symbolises our burial with Christ and our rising again with Him to newness of life (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12). The future, **συνζήσομεν**, must not be projected altogether into the resurrection life; it includes and is completed by that; and no doubt the prominent notion here is of the life to come; but here, and in Rom. vi. 8, it is implied that there is a beginning of eternal life even while we are in the flesh, *viz.* in that newness of life to which we are called, and for which we are enabled, in our baptism.

Ver. 12. **εἰ ὑπομένομεν καὶ συνβασι-**

e Tit. iii. 1, John xiv. 26, 2 Pet. i. 12, Jude 5.
f See 1 Tim. v. 21.
g See 1 Tim. ii. 3.
h Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 4.
i Here only, N.T.
k 2 Pet. ii. 6 only, N.T.

[d] ἀρνήσεται ἡμᾶς· 13. εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν, ἐκεῖνος πιστὸς μένει· ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ[1] ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται.

14. Ταῦτα [e] ὑπομίμνησκε, [f] διαμαρτυρόμενος [g] ἐνώπιον [g] τοῦ [g] Θεοῦ,[2] μὴ [h] λογομαχεῖν,[3] ἐπ' [4] οὐδὲν [i] χρήσιμον, ἐπὶ [k] καταστροφῇ τῶν

[1] Om. γὰρ ℵ[c]K, d, e, vg., go., syr[hcl], arm.

[2] So ℵCFG, 37, 67*, 80, 238, and about thirteen other cursives, f, g, boh., syr[hcl-mg], arm.-ap.-Gb., Chrys., Thphyl., Amb., Pelag.; Κυρίου ADKLP, most cursives, d, e, vg., go., syr[pesh et hcl-txt], arm.-ap.-Treg., Chrys., Euthal., Thdrt., Dam., Thphyl., Ambrst., Prim.

[3] λογομάχει AC*, d, e, f, g, vg. [4] εἰς ℵ[c]DKL.

λεύσομεν: See Matt. xxv. 34; Luke xxii. 28, 29; Acts xiv. 22; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Thess. i. 5; Rev. i. 6, xx. 4.

εἰ ἀρνησόμεθα, κ.τ.λ.: An echo of our Lord's teaching, Matt. x. 33. See also 2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude 4. "The *future* conveys the ethical possibility of the action" (Ell.)

Ver. 13. **εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν**: It is reasonable to hold that the sense of **ἀπιστέω** in this place must be determined by the antithesis of **πιστὸς μένει**. Now **πιστός**, as applied to God, must mean *faithful* (Deut. vii. 9); one who "keepeth truth for ever" (Ps. cxlvi. 6; 2 Cor. i. 18; 1 Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3; Heb. x. 23, xi. 11). There is the same contrast in Rom. iii. 3, "Shall their want of faith (**ἀπιστία**) make of none effect the faithfulness (**πίστιν**) of God?" But while we render **ἀπιστοῦμεν**, with R.V., *are faithless*, we must remember that unreliability and disbelief in the truth were closely allied in St. Paul's conception of them.

ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ—οὐ δύναται: Being essentially the unchangeable Truth, He cannot be false to His own nature, as we, when **ἀπιστοῦμεν**, are false to our better nature which has affinity with the Eternal. A lie in word, or unfaithfulness in act, is confessedly only an expedient to meet a temporary difficulty; it involves a disregard of the permanent element in our personality. The more a man realises the transitory nature of created things, and his own kinship with the Eternal, the more unnatural and unnecessary does falsity in word or deed appear to him. It is therefore inconceivable that God should lie (Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. xv. 29; Mal. iii. 6; Tit. i. 2; Heb. vi. 18). The application of the clause here is not that "He will not break faith with us" (Alf.), but that the consideration of our powerlessness to affect the constancy of God our Father should brace us up to exhibit moral courage, as being His "true children".

Vv. 14-26. Discourage the new false teaching by precept and example. There is no need, however, that you should despair of the Church. It is founded upon a rock, in spite of appearances. Take a broad view of the case: the Church is not the special apartment of the Master from which things unseemly are banished; it is a great House with places and utensils for every need of life. This great House differs from those of earth in that provision is made for the promotion of the utensils from the basest use to the Master's personal service.

Ver. 14. **ταῦτα** has special reference to the issues of life and death set out in vv. 11-13. There is no such prophylactic against striving about words as a serious endeavour to realise the relative importance of time and of eternity. "He to whom the eternal Word speaks is set at liberty from a multitude of opinions" (*De Imitatione Christi*, i. 3).

ὑπομίμνησκε: *sc.* **αὐτούς**, as in Tit. iii. 1.

διαμαρτυρόμενος: See on 1 Tim. v. 21.

ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ: It is an argument in favour of this reading that **ἐνώπιον Κυρίου** only occurs once in Paul (in a quotation), in 2 Cor. viii. 21.

λογομαχεῖν: See on 1 Tim. vi. 4.

ἐπ' οὐδὲν χρήσιμον and **ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων** are coordinate, and describe the negative and the positive results of **λογομαχία**. The subject of this **λογομαχία** is probably identical with that of the **μάχαι νομικαί** of Tit. iii. 9, which were "unprofitable and vain".

ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ, κ.τ.λ.: contrast **λόγος . . . ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας**, Eph. iv. 29; and compare the antithesis

ἀκουόντων. 15. [l] σπούδασον σεαυτὸν [m] δόκιμον [n] παραστῆσαι τῷ [1] 2 Tim. iv. 9, 21, Tit. iii. 12, verb also Gal. (1), Eph. (1), 1 Thess. (1), Heb. (1), 2 Pet. (3).
Θεῷ, ἐργάτην [o] ἀνεπαίσχυντον, [p] ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας.
16. τὰς δὲ [q] βεβήλους [q] κενοφωνίας [1] [r] περιίστασο· [s t] ἐπὶ [s t] πλεῖον

m Rom. xiv. 18, xvi. 10, 1 Cor. xi. 19, 2 Cor. x. 18. xiii. 7, Jas. i. 12. n Matt. xxvi. 53, Luke ii. 22, Acts i. 3, ix. 41, xxiii. 33, Rom. vi. 13, 16, 19, xii. 1, 1 Cor. viii. 8, 2 Cor. iv. 14, xi. 2, Eph. v. 27, Col. i. 22, 28. o Here only, not LXX. p Prov. iii. 6, xi. 5 only. q 1 Tim. vi. 20, see 1 Tim. i. 9. r Tit. iii. 9. s Acts iv. 17, xx. 9, xxiv. 4. t 2 Tim. iii. 9.

[1] **καινοφωνίας** FG, *novitates vocum* or *verborum* d, e, g, m50. See 1 Tim. vi. 20.

between **καθαίρεσις** and **οἰκοδομή** in 2 Cor. xiii. 10.

It should be added that **ἐπ' οὐδὲν χρήσιμον** is connected closely with **λογομαχεῖν** (or **λογομάχει**) by Cyr. Alex., Clem. Alex., and the Bohairic version. The Clementine Vulg. renders unambiguously, *ad nihil enim utile est;* so F.G. add **γάρ.**

In addition to the weight of adverse textual evidence against the reading **λογομάχει,** it is open to the objections that **ταῦτα—θεοῦ,** disconnected with what follows, is a feeble sentence; and that **μαρτύρομαι** and **διαμαρτύρομαι** in Paul are always followed and completed by an exhortation, *e.g.*, Eph. iv. 17; 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 1.

Ver. 15. **σπούδασον**: *Give diligence to present thyself* (as well as thy work) *to God, approved.*

ἀνεπαίσχυντον: Chrys. takes this to mean *a workman that does not scorn to put his hand to anything;* but it is better explained as *a workman who has no cause for shame when his work is being inspected.* In any case, the word must be so explained as to qualify **ἐργάτης** naturally; and therefore it cannot be interpreted by a reference to i. 8 (**μὴ ἐπαισχυνθῇς**), of the shame that may deter a man from confessing Christ.

ὀρθοτομοῦντα: **ὀρθοτομέω** is found in reff. as the translation of יִשֵּׁר (Piel) *direct, make straight, make plain.* "He shall direct thy paths," "The righteousness of the perfect shall direct his way". This use of the word suggests that the metaphor passes from the general idea of a workman to the particular notion of the minister as one who "makes straight paths" (**τροχιὰς ὀρθάς**) for the feet of his people to tread in (Heb. xii. 13). *The word of truth* is "The Way" (Acts ix. 2, etc.). Theodoret explains it of a ploughman who drives a straight furrow. Similarly R.V. m. (1), *Holding a straight course in the word of truth.* Chrys., of cutting away what is spurious or bad. Alf. follows Huther in supposing that the idea of cutting has passed out of this word, as it has out of **καινοτομεῖν,** and renders, *rightly administering,* as opposed to "adulterating the word of God" (2 Cor. ii. 17). Other examples of words which have wholly lost their derivational meaning are **πρόσφατος** and **συκοφαντέω.** The imagery underlying the A.V., R.V.m. (2), *rightly dividing,* is either that of the correct cutting up of a Levitical victim (Beza), or a father (Calvin), or steward (Vitringa), cutting portions for the food of the household. The R.V., *handling aright,* follows the Vulg., *recte tractantem,* and gives the general sense well enough. The use of **ὀρθοτομία** in the sense of *orthodoxy,* in Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. xvi., and Eus. *H. E.* iv. 3, is probably based on this passage.

Ver. 16. **κενοφωνίας**: See on 1 Tim. vi. 20. Here, as Bengel suggests, **κενο-** is contrasted with **ἀληθείας, φωνίας** with **λόγον.**

περιίστασο: *shun, devita,* "*Give them a wide berth*" (Plummer), also in Tit. iii. 9. In these places **περιίστασθαι** has the same meaning as **ἐκτρέπεσθαι,** 1 Tim. vi. 20. In fact Ell. cites from Lucian, *Hermot.* § 86, **ἐκτραπήσομαι καὶ περιστήσομαι,** where the two verbs are evidently used as indifferent alternatives. Where **περιίστημι** elsewhere occurs (N.T.), *viz.*, John xi. 42, Acts xxv. 7, it means "to stand around".

ἐπὶ πλεῖον, κ.τ.λ.: Those who utter "babblings" (subject of **προκόψουσιν**) are not, as is sometimes supposed, merely negatively useless; they are positively and increasingly mischievous. In iii. 9, **οὐ προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον,** the situation is different. When a man's **ἄνοια** has become manifest to all, he has lost his power to do mischief to others; on the other hand there is no limit to the deterioration of "evil men and impostors" in themselves, **προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον** (iii. 13).

ἀσεβείας: genitive after **ἐπὶ πλεῖον.** The commentators compare Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2, 3. **προὔκοψαν εἰς τοσοῦτον**

γὰρ [t][u] προκόψουσιν [v] ἀσεβείας· 17. καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς [w] γάγγραινα
[x] νομὴν ἕξει· ὧν ἐστὶν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φιλητός, 18. οἵτινες περὶ τὴν
ἀλήθειαν [y] ἠστόχησαν, λέγοντες [1] ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι, καὶ
[z] ἀνατρέπουσιν τήν τινων πίστιν. 19. ὁ [a] μέντοι [b] στερεὸς [c] θεμέλιος
τοῦ Θεοῦ ἕστηκεν, ἔχων τὴν [d] σφραγῖδα ταύτην, Ἔγνω Κύριος τοὺς

u Luke ii. 52, Rom. xiii. 12, Gal. i. 14, 2 Tim. iii. 9, 13; not LXX. v Rom. i. 18, xi. 26, Tit. ii. 12, Jude 15, 18. w Here only, not LXX. x John x. 9 only, N.T. y See 1 Tim. i. 6. z John ii. 15, Tit. i. 11 only, N.T. a John (5), Jas. ii. 8. Jude 8. b Heb. v. 12, 14, 1 Pet. v. 9. c See 1 Tim. vi. 19. d Rom. iv. 11, 1 Cor. ix. 2, Rev. ix. 4, etc.

[1] Ins. τὴν ACDKLP, and almost all other authorities; om. τὴν ℵFG, 17.

παρανομίας. Charles thinks **προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ κακῷ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ**, *Test. of Twelve Patriarchs*, Judah, xxi. 8, the source of this phrase; but it is merely a parallel.

Ver. 17. **ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἕξει**: *spread*, R.V.m., *ut cancer serpit*, Vulg. Ell. compares Ovid. *Metam.* ii. 825, "solet immedicabile cancer Serpere, et illaesas vitiatis addere partes". Alf. supplies many illustrations of **νομή** as "the medical term for the consuming progress of mortifying disease".

Harnack (*Mission*, vol. i., pp. 114, 115) illustrates copiously this conception of moral evil from the writings of the early fathers.

Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φίλητος. This Hymenaeus is perhaps the same as he who is mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20. Of Philetus nothing is known from other sources.

Ver. 18. **οἵτινες** implies that Hymenaeus and Philetus were only the more conspicuous members of a class of false teachers.

περὶ—ἠστόχησαν: See notes on 1 Tim. i. 6, 19.

λέγοντες, κ.τ.λ.: There can be little doubt that the false teaching here alluded to was akin to, if not the same as, that of some in Corinth a few years earlier who said, "There is no resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. xv. 12). What these persons meant was that the language of Jesus about eternal life and a resurrection received its complete fulfilment in our present conditions of existence, through the acquisition of that more elevated knowledge of God and man and morality and spiritual existence generally which Christ and His coming had imparted to mankind. This sublimest knowledge of things divine is, they said, a resurrection, and the only resurrection that men can attain unto. These false teachers combined a plausible but false spirituality, or sentimentality, with an invincible materialism; and they attempted to find support for their materialistic disbelief in the resurrection of the body in a perverse misunderstanding of the Christian language about "newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12, iii. 1). "Esse resurrectionem a mortuis, agnitionem ejus quae ab ipsis dicitur veritatis" (Irenæus, *Haer.* ii. 31, 2; *cf.* Tert. *de Resurr.* 19); an achieved moral experience, in fact; not a future hope. The heresy of Marcion, on the other hand, while denying the future resurrection of the body, affirmed positively the immortality of the soul; *cf.* Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 80. "Marcion enim in totum carnis resurrectionem non admittens, et soli animae salutem repromittens, non qualitatis sed substantiae facit quaestionem" (Tert. *adv. Marcionem*, v. 10).

τινων: See note on 1 Tim. i. 3.

Ver. 19. "We will not fear. The city of God . . . shall not be moved" (Ps. xlvi. 2, 4; *cf.* Heb. xii. 28). The Church of the New Covenant is like the Church of the Old Covenant: it has an ideal integrity unaffected by the defection of some who had seemed to belong to it. "They are not all Israel, which are of Israel. . . . All Israel shall be saved" (Rom. ix. 6, xi. 26). "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us" (1 John ii. 19). The Church, as existing in the Divine Knowledge, not as apprehended by man's intellect, is *the firm foundation of God* (R.V.), *i.e.*, that which God has firmly founded. It is called here **θεμέλιος τοῦ θεοῦ** rather than **οἶκος τ. θεοῦ**, so as to express the better its immobility, unaffected by those who **ἀνατρέπουσι, κ.τ.λ.**; *cf.* **στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας** (1 Tim. iii. 15). There can hardly be an allusion to the parable with which the Sermon on the Mount closes, Luke vi. 48, 49. With **στερεός** compare the use of **στερεόω**, Acts xvi. 5, and of **στερέωμα**, Col. ii. 5.

ἔχων τὴν σφραγῖδα: It was noted on

ὄντας αὐτοῦ, καὶ [e]Ἀποστήτω ἀπὸ ἀδικίας πᾶς ὁ [f]ὀνομάζων τὸ [f]ὄνομα Κυρίου.[1] 20. ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἐστιν μόνον σκεύη χρυσᾶ καὶ [f]ἀργυρᾶ ἀλλὰ καὶ [g]ξύλινα καὶ [h]ὀστράκινα, καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν ἃ δὲ

e See 1 Tim. iv. 1.
f Acts xix. 13, Rom. xv. 20, Eph. i. 21.
g Rev. ix. 20
h 2 Cor. iv. 7.

[1] Χριστοῦ a few cursives.

1 Tim. vi. 19 that in the two places in which **θεμέλιος** occurs in the Pastorals, there is a condensation of expression resulting in a confusion of metaphor. Here the apostle passes rapidly from the notion of the Church collectively as a foundation, or a building well founded, to that of the men and women of whom it is composed, and who have been sealed by God (see reff. and also Ezek. ix. 4; John vi. 27; 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; Rev. vii. 3, 4, 5-8). They are marked by God so as to be recognised by Him as His; and this mark also serves as a perpetual reminder to them that "they are not their own," and of their consequent obligation to holiness of life (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20). There is no allusion to the practice of carving inscriptions over doors and on pillars and foundation stones (Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20; Rev. xxi. 14). The one seal bears two inscriptions, two mutually complementary parts or aspects: (*a*) The objective fact of God's superintending knowledge of His chosen; (*b*) the recognition by the consciousness of each individual of the relation in which he stands to God, with its imperative call to holiness.

Ἔγνω Κύριος κ.τ.λ.: The words are taken from Num. xvi. 5, **ἐπέσκεπται καὶ ἔγνω ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ**, "In the morning the Lord will shew who are His". The intensive use of *know* is lilustrated by Gen. xviii. 19, Ex. xxxiii. 12, 17, Nah. i. 7, John x. 14, 27, 1 Cor. viii. 3, xiii. 12, xiv. 38, R.V.m., Gal. iv. 9.

Ἀποστήτω κ.τ.λ.: The language is perhaps another echo of the story of Korah: **Ἀποσχίσθητε ἀπὸ τῶν σκηνῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν σκληρῶν τούτων . . . μὴ συναπόλησθε ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ αὐτῶν. καὶ ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς Κόρε** (Num. xvi. 26, 27). But Isa. lii. 11 is nearer in sentiment, **ἀπόστητε ἀπόστητε, ἐξέλθατε ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἅψησθε, . . . οἱ φέροντες τὰ σκεύη Κυρίου**, *cf.* Luke xiii. 27. Also Isa. xxvi. 13, **Κύριε, ἐκτὸς σοῦ ἄλλον οὐκ οἴδαμεν, τὸ ὄνομά σου ὀνομάζομεν.** The spiritual logic of the appeal is the same as that of Gal. v. 25, "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk". Bengel thinks that **ἀπὸ ἀδικίας** is equivalent to **ἀπὸ ἀδίκων**, the abstract for the concrete; *cf.* ver. 21, "purge himself from these".

Ver. 20. Although the notional Church, the *corpus Christi verum*, is unaffected by the vacillation and disloyalty of its members, nevertheless (**δὲ**) the Church as we experience it contains many unworthy persons, the recognition of whom as members of the Church is a trial to faith. The notional Church is best figured as a foundation, which is out of sight. But the idea of the superstructure must be added in order to shadow forth the Church as it meets the eye. It is a house, a Great House too, the House of God (1 Tim. iii. 15), and therefore containing a great variety of kinds and quality of furniture and utensils. On **οἰκία**, a whole house, as distinguished from **οἶκος**, which might mean a set of rooms only, a dwelling, see Moulton in *Expositor*, vi., vii. 117. There are two thoughts in the apostle's mind, thoughts which logically are conflicting, but which balance each other in practice. These are: (1) the reality of the ideal Church, and (2) the providential ordering of the actual Church. Until the drag-net is full, and drawn up on the beach, the bad fish in it cannot be cast away (Matt. xiii. 47, 48). This is the view of the passage taken by the Latin expositors, *e.g.*, Cyprian, *Ep.* lv. 25. The explanation of the Greek commentators, that by the "great house" is meant the world at large, is out of harmony with the context. It is to be observed that St. Paul expresses here a milder and more hopeful view of the unworthy elements in the Church than he does in the parallel passage in Rom. ix. 21, 22. There "the vessels unto dishonour" are "vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction". Here they are all at least in the Great House, and all for some use, even if for less honourable purposes than those served by the vessels of gold and silver; and the next verse suggests that it is perhaps possible for that which had been a "vessel unto dishonour" to become fit for honourable use in the Master's personal service. We are reminded of the various qualities of superstructure mentioned in 1 Cor. iii. 12, "gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay,

i 1 Cor. v. 7. εἰς ἀτιμίαν. 21. ἐὰν οὖν τις [i] ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, ἔσται
k Prov. xxxi. 13, Wisd. xiii. 13, 2 Tim. iv. 11, Philem. 11 only. σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν, ἡγιασμένον,[1] [k] εὔχρηστον τῷ [l] δεσπότῃ, εἰς [m] πᾶν
l See 1 Tim. vi. 1. m 2 Tim. iii. 17, Tit. i. 16, iii. 1, see 1 Tim. ii. 10. [m] ἔργον [m] ἀγαθὸν [n] ἡτοιμασμένον. 22. τὰς δὲ [o] νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας
n Rev. ix. 7, 15, with εἰς; *cf.* Tit. iii. 1. o 3 Macc. iv. 8 only. p See 1 Tim. vi. 11. q See 1 Tim. i. 14. r Acts vii. 59, ii. 21, ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16, Rom. x. 12, 13, 14, 1 Cor. i. 2, 1 Pet. i. 17. s See 1 Tim. i. 5. t Tit. iii. 9. u Here only, N.T. v See 1 Tim. vi. 4. w See 1 Tim. iv. 7.
[p] φεῦγε· [p] δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην, [q] πίστιν, [q] ἀγάπην, εἰρήνην μετὰ [2]
[r] τῶν [r] ἐπικαλουμένων τὸν Κύριον ἐκ [s] καθαρᾶς [s] καρδίας. 23. τὰς δὲ
[t] μωρὰς καὶ [u] ἀπαιδεύτους [t v] ζητήσεις [w] παραιτοῦ, εἰδὼς ὅτι γεννῶσι

[1] Ins. καὶ ℵ^{c}C*D^{bc}KLP, f, vg., sah., syr^{hcl}, arm.

[2] Ins. πάντων ACFG^{r}G, 17, 31, 73, three others (FG, 73 om. foll. τῶν), g, sah., syr^{hcl}. See 1 Cor. i. 2.

stubble". See also Wisd. xv. 7. Field, *Notes, in loc.*, suggests that **δεσπότης** here is best rendered *the owner*. See notes on 1 Tim. iii. 15 and vi. 1.

Ver. 21. St. Paul drops the metaphor. The general meaning is clear enough, that a man may become "heaven's consummate cup," **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς** (Acts ix. 15), if he "mistake not his end, to slake the thirst of God". When we endue the vessels with consciousness, it is seen that they may "rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things". The **τις** has been, it is implied, among the "vessels unto dishonour". "Paul was an earthen vessel, and became a golden one. Judas was a golden vessel, and became an earthen one" (Chrys.). Bengel supposes that the **ἐάν τις** is an exhortation to Timothy himself. This is suggested in R.V. of ver. 22, "But flee," etc. The reference in **τούτων** is not quite clear. It is best perhaps to explain it of the false teachers themselves, "vessels unto dishonour," rather than of their teaching or immoral characteristics, though of course this is implied. The thoroughness of the separation from the corrupting environment of evil company is expressed by the **ἐκ-** and **ἀπό**. Where **ἐκκαθαίρω** occurs again, 1 Cor. v. 7, the metaphor (leaven) also refers to the removal of a corrupting personal element. There the person is to be expelled; here the persons are to be forsaken. **ἡγιασμένον** is the equivalent in actual experience of the simile **σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν**, as **εἰς πᾶν—ἡτοιμασμένον** is of **εὔχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ**. Compare 1 Cor. vi. 11, "And such were some of you: but ye were washed [lit. washed yourselves], but ye were sanctified" (**ἡγιάσθητε**).

ἡτοιμασμένον: "Even though he do not do it, he is fit for it, and has a capacity for it" (Chrys.). *Cf.* Eph. ii. 10, **κτισθέντες. . . ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν**, and reff.

Ver. 22. **νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας**: "Every inordinate desire is a youthful lust. Let the aged learn that they ought not to do the deeds of the youthful". (Chrys.). This is sound exegesis; yet it is reasonable to suppose that Timothy was still of an age to need the warning in its natural sense. See 1 Tim. iv. 12. He has just been cautioned against errors of the intellect; he must be warned also (**δὲ**) against vices of the blood.

φεῦγε· δίωκε δὲ, κ.τ.λ.: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 11.

εἰρήνην: to be joined closely with the following words, *cf.* Heb. xii. 14. While avoiding the company of evil men, he is to cultivate friendly relations with those who are sincere worshippers of the same God as himself. **οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸν Κύριον**, *i.e.*, Christ, is almost a technical term for Christians. See reff. It comes ultimately from Joel ii. 32 (iii. 5).

ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας is emphatic. See Tit. i. 15, 16.

Ver. 23. **ἀπαιδεύτους**: *ignorant*. An ignorant question is one that arises from a misunderstanding of the matter in dispute. Misunderstandings are a fruitful source of strife. *Cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 4.

παραιτοῦ: *refuse, i.e.*, Such questions will be brought before you: refuse to discuss them. The A.V., *avoid* might mean merely, Evade the necessity of meeting them.

γεννῶσι: There is no other instance of the metaphorical use of this word in the N.T.

μάχας: in the weaker sense of *contention, quarrel*, as in 2 Cor. vii. 5, Tit. iii. 9; but not Jas. iv. 1.

[x] μάχας. 24. δοῦλον δὲ Κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ [y] ἤπιον εἶναι [z] πρὸς πάντας, [a] διδακτικόν, [b] ἀνεξίκακον, 25. ἐν [c] πραΰτητι [d] παιδεύοντα τοὺς [d] ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, μή ποτε δώῃ[1] αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς [e] μετάνοιαν [f] εἰς [f] ἐπίγνωσιν [f] ἀληθείας, 26. καὶ [g] ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς [h] τοῦ [h] διαβόλου [h] παγίδος, [i] ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.

III. 1. Τοῦτο δὲ γίνωσκε[2] ὅτι ἐν [a] ἐσχάταις [a] ἡμέραις [b] ἐνστήσονται

x 2 Cor. vii. 5, Tit. iii. 9, Jas. iv. 1.
y 1 Thess. ii. 7, not LXX.
z 1 Tim. iii. 2, not LXX.
a Here only, not LXX, *cf.* Wisd. ii. 19.
b 1 Cor. iv. 21, 2 Cor. x. 1, Gal. v. 23, vi. 1, Eph. iv. 2, Col. iii. 12, Tit. iii. 2, Jas. i. 21, iii. 13, 1 Pet. iii. 15.
c See 1 Tim. i. 20.
d Here only, not LXX.
e Rom. ii. 4, 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10 (Paul).
f See 1 Tim. ii. 4.
g Here only, not LXX.
h 1 Tim. iii. 7.
i Luke v. 10 only, N.T.
a Acts ii. 17 (Joel iii. 1), Jas. v. 3, 2 Pet. iii. 3.
b 2 Thess. ii. 2, *cf.* Rom. viii. 38, 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26, Gal. i. 4, Heb. ix. 9.

[1] δῷ ℵcDcKLP, 17, many others.

[2] γινώσκετε A [FgrG, 17, one other γινώσκεται], 238, two others, g.

Ver. 24. **δοῦλον δὲ Κυρίου**: here is used in its special application to the ministers of the Church. On the general teaching, see 1 Thess. ii. 7, 1 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. iii. 2.

ἤπιος, as Ell. notes, implies gentleness in demeanour, **πραΰτης** meekness of disposition. "*Gentle* unto all men, so he will be *apt to teach; forbearing* towards opponents, so he will be able to *correct*" (Bengel).

Ver. 25. **τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους**: They who err from right thinking are to be dealt with as tenderly and considerately as they who err from right living. *Cf.* Gal. vi. 1, **καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος.** See also chap. iv. 2, and reff. Field takes **ἀντιδιατίθεσθαι** as equivalent to **ἐναντίως διατίθεσθαι**, "to be contrariwise or adversely affected". Similarly Ambrosiaster, *eos qui diversa sentiunt*. Field notes that "the only other example of the compound verb is to be found in Longinus **περὶ ὕψους**, xvii. 1". The A.V. and R.V. take the word here as middle, *them that oppose themselves*, *eos qui resistunt* [veritati] (Vulg.). von Soden finds in this word the key to the meaning of **ἀντιθέσεις**, 1 Tim. vi. 20.

μήποτε (not elsewhere in Paul) = **εἴποτε.**

δώῃ: The subjunctive seems a syntactical necessity. See J. H. Moulton, *Grammar*, vol. i. pp. 55, 193, 194, Blass, *Grammar*, p. 213. On the other hand, W. H. text, and Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 374, read **δῴη**, optative.

μετάνοιαν: It is certainly implied that false theories in religion are not unconnected with moral obliquity and faulty practice. See Tit. i. 15, 16, iii. 11.

Ver. 26. **ἀνανήψωσιν** is to be connected with **εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.** Compare **ἐκνήψατε δικαίως**, 1 Cor. xv. 34. **ἐκείνου** then refers to **ὁ θεός**, and **θέλημα** will have its usual force as the Will of God (see 1 Pet. iv. 2): *That they who had been taken captive by the devil may recover themselves* (*respiscant*, Vulg.) *out of his snare, so as to serve the will of God.* This is Beza's explanation and that of von Soden (nearly), who compares **αἰχμαλωτίζοντες**, 2 Cor. x. 5. It has the advantage of giving a natural reference to **αὐτοῦ** and **ἐκείνου** respectively, which are employed accurately in iii. 9. The paradoxical use of **ζωγρέω** in Luke v. 10 must not be taken as determining the use of the word elsewhere. Of the other explanations, that of the A.V. and Vulg., which supposes an inelegant but not impossible reference of both **αὐτοῦ** and **ἐκείνου** to **τοῦ διαβόλου**, is preferable to the R.V., following Wetstein and Bengel, which refers **αὐτοῦ** back to **δοῦλον Κυρίου**, and dissociates **ἐζωγρημένοι** from **παγίδος**, with which it is naturally connected. The reference of **αὐτοῦ** and **ἐκείνου** to the same subject, as given in the A.V., is paralleled by Wisd. i. 16, **συνθήκην ἔθεντο πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος εἶναι.**

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-9. Evil times are upon us; we have indeed amongst us specimens of the perennial impostor, worthy successors of Jannes and Jambres. The shortlived nature of their success, will be, however, patent to all.

Ver. 1. **ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται**: Although St. Paul had abandoned his once confident expectation that the Lord would come again during his own lifetime, it is plain that here, as in 1 Tim. iv. 1, he regards the time now present as part of the last days. See **ἀποτρέπου . . . εἰσιν οἱ ἐνδύνοντες**, vv. 5, 6. The prophetical form of the sentence is a

[c] Matt. viii. 28 only, N.T., Wisd. iii. 19, xvii. 11, xix. 13, Isa. xviii. 2, 2 Macc. (3), 4 Macc. (3). καιροὶ [c]χαλεποί· 2. ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι [d]φίλαυτοι, [e]φιλάργυροι, [f]ἀλαζόνες, [g]ὑπερήφανοι, [h]βλάσφημοι, γονεῦσιν [i]ἀπειθεῖς, [k]ἀχάριστοι, [l]ἀνόσιοι, 3. [m]ἄστοργοι, [n]ἄσπονδοι, [o]διάβολοι, [p]ἀκρατεῖς, [q]ἀνήμεροι, [r]ἀφιλάγαθοι, 4. [s]προδόται, [t]προπετεῖς, [u]τετυφωμένοι, [v]φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ [w]φιλόθεοι, 5. ἔχοντες [x]μόρφωσιν

[d] Here only, not LXX. [e] Luke xvi. 14, 4 Macc. ii. 8 only. [f] Rom. i. 30 only, N.T. [g] Luke i. 51, Rom. i. 30, Jas. iv. 6 = 1 Pet. v. 5 (Prov. iii. 4). [h] 1 Tim. i. 13. [i] Rom. i. 30, *cf.* Tit. i. 16, iii. 3. [k] Luke vi. 35, Wisd. (1), Ecclus. (2), 4 Macc. (1). [l] See 1 Tim. i. 9. [m] Rom. i. 31, not LXX. [n] Here only, not LXX. [o] See 1 Tim. iii. 11. [p] Prov. xxvii. 20 only. [q] Here only, not LXX. [r] Here only, not LXX, *cf.* Tit. i. 8. [s] Luke vi. 16, Acts vii. 52. [t] Acts xix. 36, Prov. x. 14, xiii. 3, Ecclus. ix. 18. [u] See 1 Tim. iii. 6. [v] Here only, not LXX. [w] Here only, not LXX. [x] Rom. ii. 20 only, not LXX.

rhetorical way of saying that things are going from bad to worse. The same account is to be given of 2 Pet. iii. 3; Jude 18. St. John says plainly, "It is the last hour" (1 John ii. 18). See note on 1 Tim. iv. 1.

ἐνστήσονται: *will be upon us*, *instabunt* (Vulg.).

χαλεποί: *grievous* (R.V.); but not necessarily *perilous* (A.V.) to those who feel their grievousness.

Ver. 2. **οἱ ἄνθρωποι**: *mankind* in general, not **οἱ ἄνδρες**. This list of human vices should be compared with that given in Rom. i. 29 *sqq.*; **ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἄστοργοι** are common to both passages. **φίλαυτοι** appropriately heads the array, egoism or self-centredness being the root of almost every sin, just as love which "seeketh not its own" (1 Cor. xiii. 5) is "the fulfilment of the law" (Rom. xiii. 10). **φιλαυτία** is used favourably by Aristotle in the sense of *self-respect* (*Nic. Eth.* ix. 8. 7). But "once the sense of sin is truly felt, self-respect becomes an inadequate basis for moral theory. So Philo (*de Prof.* 15) speaks of those who are **φίλαυτοι δὴ μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι**" (Dean Bernard, *in loc*).

φιλάργυροι: covetousness (**πλεονεξία**, Rom. i. 29) naturally springs from, or is one form of, selfishness; but we cannot suppose with Chrys. that there is a similar sequence intended all through.

Other compounds of **φιλ.-** in the Pastorals, besides the five that occur here, are **φιλάγαθος**, Tit. i. 8, **φίλανδρος, φιλότεκνος**, Tit. ii. 4, **φιλανθρωπία**, Tit. iii. 4, **φιλόξενος**, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 8.

ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι: *elati*, *superbi*. The **ἀλαζών**, *boastful*, betrays his character by his words; the **ὑπερήφανος**, *haughty*, more usually by his demeanour and expression.

βλάσφημοι: *abusive*, *railers* (R.V.); not necessarily *blasphemers* (A.V.).

γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς and **ἀχάριστοι** naturally go together; since, as Bengel observes, gratitude springs from filial duty.

Ver. 3. **ἄστοργοι**: *without natural affection*, *sine affectione*. This and the three preceding adjectives appear to have teference to domestic relations.

ἄσπονδοι: *implacable*, *sine pace* (*absque foedere*, Rom. i. 31); not *truce-breakers* (A.V.), which would be **ἀσύνθετοι**, Rom. i. 31; the **ἄσπονδος** refuses to treat with his foe at all.

διάβολοι: A.V.m. here and in Tit. ii. 3, has *makebates*. See note on 1 Tim. iii. 11.

ἀκρατεῖς: *without self-control* (R.V.) rather than *incontinent* (A.V.). The latter word has a purely sexual reference, whereas **ἀκρατεῖς**, as Chrys. notes, is used "with respect both to their tongue, and their appetite, and everything else". It is naturally coupled with **ἀνήμεροι**, *fierce*, *immites*. "Simul et molles et duri" (Bengel).

ἀφιλάγαθοι: *No lovers of good* (R.V.), the *good* being "things true, honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report" (Phil. iv. 8). The positive **φιλάγαθος**, Tit. i. 8, has the same reference. It is a characteristic of the heavenly Wisdom (Wisd. vii. 22). The A.V. in both places narrows the reference to persons: *Despisers of those that are good; A lover of good men.* The Vulg. *sine benignitate*, *benignum*, does not express the active positive force of the Greek. **φιλάγαθος** and **ἀφιλάργυρος** are applied to the Emperor Antoninus in a papyrus of ii. A.D. which also uses the term **ἀφιλοκαγαθία** (perh. = **ἀφιλοκαλοκαγαθία**) of Marcus Aurelius (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 376).

Ver. 4. **προδόται**: has no special reference to persecution of Christians.

τετυφωμένοι: See note on 1 Tim. iii. 6.

Ver. 5. **ἔχοντες** (see note on 1 Tim. i.

[y] εὐσεβείας τὴν δὲ [z] δύναμιν αὐτῆς [a] ἠρνημένοι· καὶ τούτους [b] ἀπο- τρέπου. 6. ἐκ τούτων γάρ εἰσιν οἱ [c] ἐνδύνοντες εἰς τὰς οἰκίας καὶ [d] αἰχμαλωτίζοντες [1] [e] γυναικάρια [f] σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις, [g] ἀγόμενα [h] ἐπιθυμίαις [h i] ποικίλαις, 7. πάντοτε μανθάνοντα καὶ μηδέποτε [k] εἰς [k] ἐπίγνωσιν [k] ἀληθείας [k] ἐλθεῖν δυνάμενα. 8. ὃν τρόπον δὲ Ἰαννῆς

y See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
z 1 Cor. ii. 5, iv. 19, 20, 1 Thess. i. 5. Heb. vii. 16.
a See 1 Tim. v. 8.
b Here only, N.T., 4 Macc. i. 33, etc.
c Here only, N.T.
d Luke xxi. 24, Rom. vii. 23, 2 Cor. x. 5.
e Here only, not LXX.
f Prov. xxv. 22, Judith xv. 11, Rom. xii. 20.
g Rom. ii. 4, viii. 14, 1 Cor. xii. 2, Gal. v. 18.
h Tit. iii. 3.
i Matt. iv. 24 (π. νόσοις) = Mark i. 34 = Luke iv. 40, Heb. ii. 4, xiii. 9, Jas. i. 2, 1 Pet. i. 6, iv. 10.
k See 1 Tim. ii. 4.

[1] αἰχμαλωτεύοντες [Eph. iv. 8] DcKL; add τὰ a few cursives.

19) **μόρφωσιν, κ.τ.λ.**: *Habentes speciem quidem pietatis.* We have an exact parallel in Tit. i. 16, **θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται.** They were professing Christians, but nothing more; genuine Christians must also be professing Christians. This consideration removes any difficulty that may be felt by a comparison of this passage with Rom. ii. 20, where it is implied that it is a point in the Jew's favour that he has **τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ.** The **μόρφωσις,** embodiment, is external in both cases, but not unreal as far as it goes. The ineffectiveness of it arises from the co-existence in the mind of him who "holds" it of some other quality that neutralises the advantage naturally derivable from the possession of the **μόρφωσις** in question. In this case, it was that they of whom St. Paul is speaking had a purely theoretical, academic apprehension of practical Christianity (**εὐσέβεια,** see 1 Tim. ii. 2), but a positive disbelief in the Gospel as a regenerating force. Compare what St. John says of the rulers who believed on Jesus but did not confess Him (John xii. 42, 43). They too were **φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι.** In *Romans* the case is similar: the possession of an admirable moral code did not make the Jew's moral practice better than that of the Gentile (see Sanday and Headlam on Rom. ii. 20). There is therefore no necessity to suppose with Lightfoot that "the termination **-ωσις** denotes the aiming after or affecting the **μορφή**" (*Journal of Class. and Sacr. Philol.* (1857), iii. 115).

δύναμιν: the opposition between **μόρφωσις** and **δύναμις** here is the same as that between **δύναμις** and **σοφία** in 1 Cor. ii. 5, or **λόγος,** 1 Cor. iv. 19, 20, 1 Thess. i. 5; see also Heb. vii. 16.

ἠρνημένοι: *To deny a thing* or *a person* involves always more than an act of the mind; it means carrying the negation into practice. See on 1 Tim. v. 8.

καί: perhaps refers back to ii. 22, 23.

Ver. 6. **ἐνδύνοντες**: *who insinuate themselves into houses* [which they overthrow], Tit. i. 11. "Observe how he shows their impudence by this expression, their dishonourable ways, their deceitfulness" (Chrys.). **παρεισέδυησαν** (Jude 4) and **παρεισῆλθον** (Gal. ii. 4) are similar expressions.

γυναικάρια: *Mulierculas.* Chrys. acutely implies that the victims of the crafty heretics were "silly women" of both sexes: "He who is easy to be deceived is a silly woman, and nothing like a man; for to be deceived is the part of silly women". St. Paul, however, refers to women only.

σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις: *overwhelmed*, rather than *burdened* (**βεβαρημένα**) (Field). Is there any contrast implied between the diminutive, indicating the insignificance of the women, and the load of sins which they carry? De Wette (quoted by Alf.), notes that a sin-laden conscience is easily tempted to seek the easiest method of relief.

ποικίλαις: There is no great difficulty in diverting them from the right path, for they are inconstant even in vice.

Ver. 7. **πάντοτε μανθάνοντα**: They have never concentrated their attention on any spiritual truth so as to have learnt it and assimilated it. They are always being attracted by "some newer thing," **τι καινότερον** (Acts xvii. 21), and thus their power of comprehension becomes atrophied.

μηδέποτε: For negatives with the participle, see Blass, *Grammar*, p. 255.

εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας: See on 1 Tim. ii. 4.

Ver. 8. The apostle now returns from the **γυναικάρια** to their seducers, whom he compares to the magicians who withstood Moses and Aaron, both

1 Acts xiii. 8, etc., Rom. ix. 19, xiii. 2, Gal. ii. 11, Eph. vi. 13, 2 Tim. iv. 15, etc. καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς[1] [l] ἀντέστησαν Μωυσεῖ, οὕτως καὶ οὗτοι [l] ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἄνθρωποι [m] κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, [n] ἀδόκιμοι [o] περὶ τὴν [o] πίστιν. 9. ἀλλ' οὐ [p] προκόψουσιν [p] ἐπὶ [p] πλεῖον, ἡ γὰρ [q] ἄνοια αὐτῶν [r] ἔκδηλος ἔσται πᾶσιν, ὡς καὶ ἡ ἐκείνων ἐγένετο.

m Here only, N.T., *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 5. 10. [s] Σὺ [s] δὲ [t] παρηκολούθησάς[2] μου τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ [u] ἀγωγῇ,

n Rom. i. 28, 1 Cor. ix. 27, 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6, 7, Tit. i. 16, Heb. vi. 8. o 1 Tim. i. 19, vi. 21. p See 2 Tim. ii. 16. q Wisd. xv. 18, xix. 3, etc., Luke vi. 11 only, N.T. r 3 Macc. iii. 19, vi. 5 only. s See 1 Tim. vi. 11. t See 1 Tim. iv. 6. u Here only, N.T., Esth. (2), 2 Macc. (3), 3 Macc. (1).

[1] Μαμβρῆς FG, d, e, f, g, m^{50}, vg., go.

[2] So ℵAC [FG, ἠκολούθησας], 17; παρηκολούθηκας DKLP. See 1 Tim. iv. 6.

in their hostility to the truth and in their subsequent fate. St. Paul is the earliest extant authority for the names; but of course he derived them from some source, written (Origen), or unwritten (Theodoret), it is immaterial which. But the former theory is the more probable. The book is called by Origen (*in Matt.* p. 916, on Matt. xxvii. 8), *Jannes et Mambres liber*, and is perhaps identical with *Pœnitentia Jamnis et Mambrae* condemned in the *Decretum Gelasii*. Pliny, whose *Natural History* appeared in A.D. 77, mentions Jannes along with Moses and Lotapis (or Jotapis) as Jewish Magi posterior to Zoroastes (*Hist. Nat.* xxx. 1). He is followed by Apuleius, *Apol.* c. 90. Numenius (quoted by Eusebius (*Prep. Ev.* ix. 8) mentions Jannes and Jambres as magicians who resisted Moses. In the Targ. of Jonathan on Ex. vii. 11, the names are given as יניס ויממריס, Janis and Jamberes; but in the Talmud as יחנא וממרא, Jochana and Mamre. It is generally agreed that Jannes is a form of Jochanan (Johannes), and that Jambres is from the Hiphil of מרה to rebel. For the legends associated with these names, see art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

ἀντέστησαν: The same word is used of Elymas the Sorcerer, Acts xiii. 8. The **οὕτως** refers rather to the degree of their hostility than to the manner in which it was expressed, *i.e.*, by magical arts. At the same time, it is possible that magic was practised by the false teachers; they are styled impostors, **γόητες**, in ver. 13; and Ephesus was a home of magic. See Acts xix. 19.

κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν: *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 5, **διεφθαρμ. τὸν νοῦν.** This is the Pauline equivalent for the Platonic "lie in the soul". **κατεφθ.** is not coordinate with **ἀδόκ.**; the latter is the exemplification of the former.

ἀδόκιμοι: *reprobate.* The A.V.m. gives the word here, and in Tit. i. 16, an active force, *of no judgment, void of judgment.* For **περί** with the acc. see on 1 Tim. i. 19.

Ver. 9. **οὐ προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον**: There is only a verbal inconsistency between this statement and those in ii. 16 and iii. 13, where see notes. The meaning here is that there will be a limit to the success of the false teachers. They will be exposed, found out; those to whom that fact is apparent will not be imposed on any more. In ii. 16, the increasing impiety of the teachers and the cancerous growth of their teaching is alleged as a reason why Timothy should avoid them. In ver. 13, **προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον** does not indicate success in gaining adherents, but simply advance in degradation. "Saepe malitia, quum late non potest, profundius proficit" (Bengel).

ἄνοια: *dementia* (m^{50}) is nearer the mark than *insipientia* (Vulg.).

ὡς καὶ ἡ ἐκείνων ἐγένετο: "Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods" (Ex. vii. 12); they failed to produce lice (viii. 18). "And the magicians could not stand before Moses because of the boils; for the boils were upon the magicians" (ix. 11). During the plague of darkness, "they lay helpless, made the sport of magic art, and a shameful rebuke of their vaunts of understanding" (Wisd. xvii. 7).

Vv. 10-17. I am not really uneasy about your steadfastness. You joined me as a disciple from spiritual and moral inducements only. The persecutions you saw me endure you knew to be typical of the conditions of a life of godliness. Stand in the old paths. Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures on which your growing mind was fed is never out of date as an equipment for the man of God.

Ver. 10: **παρηκολούθησας**: See on 1 Tim. iv. 6. *Thou didst follow* (R.V.),

τῇ [v] προθέσει, τῇ πίστει, τῇ [w] μακροθυμίᾳ, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ [x] ὑπομονῇ, 11. τοῖς [y] διωγμοῖς, τοῖς [z] παθήμασιν, οἷά μοι ἐγένετο ἐν [a] Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἐν [a] Ἰκονίῳ, ἐν Λύστροις, οἵους [y] διωγμοὺς [a] ὑπήνεγκα· καὶ ἐκ πάντων με [b] ἐρύσατο ὁ Κύριος. 12. καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ θέλοντες [c d] ζῆν [c d] εὐσεβῶς [1] [e] ἐν [e] Χριστῷ [c] Ἰησοῦ [f] διωχθήσονται. 13. πονηροὶ δὲ ἄνθρωποι καὶ [g] γόητες [h] προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, [i] πλανῶντες καὶ [k] πλανώμενοι. 14. [l] σὺ [l] δὲ [m] μένε [m] ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ [n] ἐπιστώθης,

v Acts xi. 23, xxvii. 13.
w See 1 Tim. i. 16, 2 Cor. vi. 6, Gal. v. 22, Eph. iv. 2, Col. i. 11, iii. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 2, Heb. vi. 12, Jas. v. 10 (of man).

x See 1 Tim. vi. 11. y Acts xiii. 50, Rom. viii. 35, 2 Cor. xii. 10, 2 Thess. i. 4. z Rom. viii. 18, 2 Cor. i. 5, 6, 7, Phil. iii. 10, Col. i. 24, Heb. ii. 10, x. 32, 1 Pet. iv. 13, v. 9, etc., not LXX.
a 1 Cor. x. 13, 1 Pet. ii. 19, only, N.T. b Matt. vi. 13, Rom. xv. 31, 2 Cor. i. 10, 2 Thess. iii. 2, 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, 2 Pet. ii. 7, 9. c Tit. ii. 12. d 4 Macc. vii. 21 only. e Rom. vi. 11, *cf.* Gal. ii. 20. f Matt. v. 10, 11, John xv. 20, 1 Cor. iv. 12, 2 Cor. iv. 9, Gal. v. 11, etc. g Here only, not LXX. h See 2 Tim. ii. 16. i Matt. xxiv. 4, 5, 11, 24 (= Mark xiii. 5, 6), 1 John i. 8, ii. 26, iii. 7, Rev. (7), etc. k Matt. xviii. 12, Tit. iii. 3, Heb. v. 2, 1 Pet. ii. 25, etc. l See 1 Tim. vi. 11. m See 1 Tim. ii. 15. n Here only, N.T.

[1] So ℵAP, 17, 37, two others; εὐσεβῶς ζῆν CDFGKL.

is susceptible of the meaning "Thou wert attracted as a disciple to me on account of". It is not necessarily implied that Timothy had copied his master in all these respects. The A.V., *Thou hast fully known*, follows the A.V. of Luke i. 3. This translation fails to bring out the appeal to Timothy's loyalty which underlies the passage. The aorist is appropriate here, because St. Paul is recalling to Timothy's recollection the definite occasion in the past when the youth cast in his lot with him. He is not thinking, as in 1 Tim. iv. 6, of Timothy's consistent discipleship up to the moment of writing. Bengel quotes aptly 2 Macc. ix. 27, παρακολουθοῦντα τῇ ἐμῇ προαιρέσει. (So cod. Venetus: A has συνσταθέντα for παρακολ.) This limitation of the reference explains why St. Paul mentions only the places in which he suffered on his first missionary journey.

διδασκαλίᾳ: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ἀγωγῇ: *conduct* (R.V.). The A.V., *manner of life* has perhaps reference to guiding principles of conduct rather than to the external expression of them, which is meant here.

προθέσει: For πρόθεσις in this sense of human purpose see reff. Here it means what St. Paul had set before himself as the aim of his life. In Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11, 2 Tim. i. 9 the word is used of God's eternal purpose for man.

ὑπομονῇ: See on 1 Tim. vi. 11.

Ver. 11. Ἀντιοχείᾳ: Acts xiii. 14, 45, 50; Ἰκονίῳ: Acts xiv. 1, 2, 5; Λύστροις: Acts xiv. 6, 19.

οἵους διωγμούς: There is no necessity to supply, with Alf., "Thou sawest".

καί: *and yet.* The verse is an echo of Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 18, ὁ Κύριος . . . ἐκ πασῶν τῶν θλίψεων αὐτῶν ἐρύσατο αὐτούς. See also reff.

Ver. 12. This verse is an interesting example of the effect of association of ideas. St. Paul's teaching after his persecutions at Antioch, etc., had strongly emphasised this topic. St. Luke (Acts xiv. 22) actually repeats the very words used by the preachers, "Through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God". Consistency in the life in Christ must necessarily be always opposed by the world. θέλοντες is emphatic, as Ell. notes, "whose will is". *Cf.* Luke xiv. 28, John vii. 17.

εὐσεβῶς of course qualifies ζῆν, as in Tit. ii. 12. There is a similar extension of thought, from self to all, in iv. 8.

Ver. 13. πονηροὶ δὲ: The antithesis seems to be between the apparent discomfiture of those who wish to live in Christ (their persecution being after all almost a means conditional to their attaining their desire), and the paradoxical success of evil men; they advance indeed; but only in degradation; *proficient in peius* (Vulg.). See notes on ver. 9 and ii. 16.

γόητες, *impostors* (R.V.), *seductores*, exactly expresses the term. γοητεία occurs 2 Macc. xii. 24, where it means *trickery*.

πλανώμενοι: *cf.* Tit. iii. 3. Those who deceive others impair, in so doing, their sense of the distinction between truth and falsehood, and thus weaken their power of resistance to self-deceit, and to imposition by others.

προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον: See on ver. 9.

Ver. 14. σὺ δὲ μένε: Both σύ and μένε are in strong contrast to the πονηροὶ

o Ecclus. (1), 1 Macc. (1), 2 Macc. (1), 3 Macc. (1), 4 Macc. (1), Luke (5), Acts vii. 19, 1 Pet. ii. 2. p 1 Cor. ix. 13 only, N.T. q John vii. 15, Acts xxvi. 24. r Ps. xviii. (xix.) 7, civ. (cv.) 22, cxviii. (cxix.) 98. s Phil. i. 19, 2 Thess. ii. 13, 1 Pet. i. 5, ii. 2, *cf.* Rom. i. 16, x. 1, 10, 2 Cor. vii. 10, Heb. ix. 28, xi. 7. t 1 Tim. iii. 13. u Here only, not LXX.

εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνων[1] ἔμαθες, 15. καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ [o]βρέφους [2 p]ἱερὰ [q]γράμματα οἶδας τὰ δυνάμενά σε [r]σοφίσαι [s]εἰς [s]σωτηρίαν διὰ [t]πίστεως [t]τῆς [t]ἐν [t]Χριστῷ [t]Ἰησοῦ. 16. πᾶσα γραφὴ [u]θεόπνευστος

[1] So ℵAC*FgrGP, 17, one other, d, e, g; τίνος CcDKL, f, vg., go., boh., syrr., arm.

[2] Ins. τὰ AC*DcKLP; om. τὰ ℵCbD*FG, 17, arm.

ἄνθρωποι and προκόψουσιν of ver. 13. The exhortation is illustrated by 2 John 9, πᾶς ὁ προάγων, καὶ μὴ μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει. The conservatism here enjoined concerns more especially the fundamental ethical teaching common to the Old Covenant and the New. For the idiom, see note on 1 Tim. ii. 15.

ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστώθης: ἅ, supplied out of ἐν οἷς, is the direct object of ἔμαθες, and remoter object of ἐπιστώθης.

ἐπιστώθης: The Latin versions blunder here, *quae . . . credita sunt tibi.* This would be the translation of ἐπιστεύθης. πιστόομαί τι means *to have received confirmation of the truth of a thing.* Bengel, rendering "fidelis et firmus es redditus," compares Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 8, οὐκ ἐπιστώθη μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, and 37, οὐδὲ ἐπιστώθησαν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ αὐτοῦ.

εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνων ἔμαθες: It has to be remembered that St. Paul is speaking of moral, not intellectual, authority. The truths for which St. Paul is contending were commended to Timothy by the sanction of the best and noblest personalities whom he had ever known or heard of. The characters of Timothy's revered parent and teachers—of Eunice, Lois, the prophets, and Paul, to enumerate them in the order in which they had touched his life—had been moulded in a certain school of morals. Their characters had admittedly stood the test of life. What more cogent argument could Timothy have for the truth and reasonableness of their moral teaching?

Ver. 15. **καὶ ὅτι**: dependent on **εἰδώς**. For the change of construction, von Soden compares Rom. ix. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Timothy's knowledge of things divine was derived not merely from persons, but from sacred writings; and, perhaps, as Theophylact notes, the two points are emphasised: (*a*) that the persons were of no ordinary merit, and (*b*) that his knowledge of Scripture was conterminous with the whole of his conscious existence. He could not recall a period when he had not known sacred writings. This is the force of the hyperbolic **ἀπὸ βρέφους**.

ἱερὰ γράμματα: *sacras litteras, sacred writings* (R.V.). For this use of **γράμματα** see John vii. 15, and Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 383. The force of this peculiar phrase is that Timothy's A B C lessons had been of a sacred nature. The usual N.T. equivalent for *the Holy Scriptures* (A.V.) is **αἱ γραφαί** or **ἡ γραφή** (once **γραφαὶ ἅγιαι**, Rom. i. 2); but St. Paul here deliberately uses an ambiguous term in order to express vigorously the notion that Timothy's first lessons were in Holy Scripture. **τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα** is found in Josephus, *Antiq.* Prooem 3 and x. 10, 4, and elsewhere. *Cf.* **παραναγνοὺς τὴν ἱερὰν βίβλον** (2 Macc. viii. 23). There may be also an allusion to **γράμματα** of the false teachers which were not **ἱερά**. See on next verse.

σοφίσαι: *instruere*, *cf.* Ps. xviii. (xix.) 8, **ἡ μαρτυρία Κυρίου πιστή, σοφίζουσα νήπια.** Also Ps. civ. (cv.) 22, cxviii. (cxix.) 98. The word is chosen for its O.T. reference, and also because of its strictly *educational* association.

εἰς σωτηρίαν: a constant Pauline phrase. See reff.

διὰ πίστεως: to be joined closely with **σοφίσαι**. *Cf. de Imitatione Christi*, iii. 2, "Let not Moses nor any prophet speak to me; but speak thou rather, O Lord God, who art the inspirer and enlightener of all the prophets; for thou alone without them canst perfectly instruct me, but they without thee will avail nothing. They may indeed sound forth words, but they do not add to them the Spirit. . . . They shew the way, but thou givest strength to walk in it," etc.

Ver. 16. In the absence of any extant Greek MS. authority for the omission of **καί** before **ὠφέλιμος**, we may assume that the early writers who ignored it did so from carelessness. The sentence then

καὶ[1] [v]ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς [w]ἐλεγμόν,[2] πρὸς [x]ἐπανόρ- v See 1 Tim. iv. 8.
θωσιν, πρὸς [y]παιδείαν [z]τὴν [z]ἐν [z]δικαιοσύνῃ· 17. ἵνα [a]ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ w Here only, N.T.
τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος, [b]πρὸς [b]πᾶν [b]ἔργον [b]ἀγαθὸν [c]ἐξηρτισμένος. x 1 Esd. viii. 52, 1 Macc. xiv. 34 only.
IV. 1. [a]Διαμαρτύρομαι[3] [b]ἐνώπιον [b]τοῦ [b]Θεοῦ καὶ[4] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,[5]

y Eph. vi. 4, Heb. xii. 5, 7, 8, 11. z Tit. iii. 5, *cf.* Eph. iv. 24. a Here only, not LXX. b See 2 Tim. ii. 21 and 1 Tim. ii. 10. c Exod. xxviii. 7, Acts xxi. 5 only. a See 1 Tim. v. 21. b See 1 Tim. ii. 3.

[1] Om. καί bef. ὠφέλιμος f, vg^{cle}. boh., syr^{pesh}.
[2] So ℵACFG, 31, 80, two others; ἔλεγχον DKLP.
[3] Ins. οὖν ἐγὼ D^{c}KL, syr^{hcl}.
[4] Ins. τοῦ Κυρίου D^{c}KL, go., syr^{pesh} and syr^{hcl} c.*
[5] Ἰησ. Χριστ. D^{c}KL, vg^{cle}, syrr., arm.

is best taken as a repetition and expansion of that which has just preceded; **θεόπνευστος** corresponding to **ἱερά**, and **ὠφέλιμος, κ.τ.λ.**, to **σοφίσαι, κ.τ.λ.**: *Every writing which is inspired by God is also profitable.* **γραφή** of course has exclusive reference to the definite collection of writings which St. Paul usually designates as **ἡ γραφή** or **αἱ γραφαί**; but it is used here in a partitive, not in a collective sense. A parallel case is John xix. 36, 37, **ἡ γραφή . . . ἑτέρα γραφή.** Hence the rendering *writing* or *passage* is less free from ambiguity than *scripture* (R.V.). The nearest parallel to this *ascensive* use of **καί**, as Ellicott terms it, is Gal. iv. 7, **εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος.** See also Luke i. 36, Acts xxvi. 26, xxviii. 28, Rom. viii. 29.

θεόπνευστος: If there is any polemical force in this adj., it is in reference to heretical writings, the contents of which were merely intellectual, not edifying. In any case, the greatest stress is laid on **ὠφέλιμος.** St. Paul would imply that the best test of a **γραφή** being **θεόπνευστος** would be its proved serviceableness for the moral and spiritual needs of man. See Rom. xv. 4, 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. This, the R.V. explanation of the passage, is that given by Origen, Chrys., Thdrt., syrr., the Clementine Vulg., *Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est ad docendum etc.* [The true Vulg. text, however, is *insp. div. et utilis ad doc.*] The other view (A.V., R.V.m.), which takes **καί** as a simple copula, *Every Scripture is inspired and profitable*, is open to the objection that neither in the antecedent nor in the following context is there any suggestion that the inspiration of Scripture was being called in question; the theme of the passage being the moral equipment of the man of God. For this view are cited Greg. Naz., Ath. It is to be added that it is possible to render **πᾶσα γραφή**, *the whole of Scripture*, on the analogy of Matt. ii. 3, **πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα** (Eph. ii. 21 cannot be safely adduced as a case in point); but it is unnecessary and unnatural.

διδασκαλίαν (see notes on 1 Tim. i. 10) and **ἐλεγμόν** represent respectively positive and negative teaching. Similarly **ἐπανόρθωσιν** and **παιδείαν** have relation respectively to "the raising up of them that fall," and the disciplining the unruly; *ad corrigendum, ad erudiendum* (Vulg.).

τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ: a **παιδεία** *which is exercised in righteousness.* Compare the dissertation on the **παιδεία Κυρίου**, Heb. xii. 5 *sqq.* **παιδεία** in reff. is used in relation to children only.

Ver. 17. **ἄρτιος**: *perfectus, completely equipped* for his work as a Man of God. **τέλειος** would have reference to his performance of it.

ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος: see on 1 Tim. vi. 11. *The Man of God* has here a primary reference to the minister of the Gospel.

πρὸς πᾶν, κ.τ.λ.: see ii. 21; and, for this use of **πρός**, 1 Pet. iii. 15, 2 Cor. ii. 16, x. 4, Eph. iv. 29, Heb. v. 14; and on **ἐξαρτίζω**, Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 285.

Cf. the use of **καταρτίζω**, Luke vi. 40, 2 Cor. xiii. 11, Heb. xiii. 21, 1 Pet. v. 10.

CHAPTER IV.—Vv. 1-8. I solemnly charge you, in view of the coming judgment, to be zealous in the exercise of your ministry while the opportunity lasts, while people are willing to listen to your admonitions. Soon the craze for novelty will draw men away from sober truth to fantastic figments. Do you stand your ground. Fill the place which my death will leave vacant. My course is run, my crown is awaiting me. "My crown" did

c See 1 Tim. vi. 14. τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν [1] ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ [2] τὴν [c] ἐπιφάνειαν
d Luke (7), Acts (11), 1 Thess. v. 3, 2 Tim. iv. 6. αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ· 2. κήρυξον τὸν λόγον, [d] ἐπίστηθι
e Ecclus. xviii. 22, Mark xiv. 11 only, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 12. f Ecclus. xxxv. (xxxii.) 4, only. *cf.* Phil. iv. 10. g Matt. (7), Mark (9), Luke (12), Jude 9. h See 1 Tim. i. 16 and 2 Tim. iii. 10. i 1 Tim. i. 10 (*q.v.*), Tit. i. 9, ii. 1.
[e] εὐκαίρως [f] ἀκαίρως, ἔλεγξον, [g] ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον,[3] ἐν [h] πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ. 3. ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς [i] ὑγιαινούσης

[1] κρῖναι FG, 17, 67**, six others. [2] κατὰ ℵcDcKLP, vgcle, go., syrr., arm.
[3] ἐπιτίμ. παρακάλ. ℵcACDgrKLP, syrhcl, arm.; παρακάλ. ἐπιτίμ. ℵ*FG, 37, one other, d, e, f, g, vg., go., boh.; om. παρακάλ. syrpesh.

I say? Nay, there is a crown for you, too, and for all who live in the loving longing for the coming of their Lord.

Ver. 1. **Διαμαρτύρομαι**: See on 1 Tim. v. 21. As the adjuration follows immediately on warnings against a moral degeneration which had already set in and would increase, it is appropriate that it should contain a solemn assurance of judgment to come.

Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν: This was a prominent topic in St. Paul's preaching (Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 5). **κρῖναι** is the tense used in the Creeds, as in 1 Pet. iv. 5. (Tisch. R.V.). See *apparat. crit.*

ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς: To be understood literally. See 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν: *per adventum ipsius* (Vulg.). The acc. is that of the thing by which a person adjures, as in the case of **ὁρκίζω** (Mark v. 7; Acts xix. 13; *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 27). The use of **διαμαρτύρομαι** with an acc. in Deut. iv. 26, xxxi. 28, is different, **διαμαρτ. ὑμῖν σήμερον τόν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.** "I call heaven and earth to witness against you." Heaven and earth can be conceived as personalities, *cf.* Ps. l. 4; not so the appearance or kingdom of Christ. On **ἐπιφάνεια** see note on 1 Tim. vi. 14.

βασιλείαν: The perfected kingdom, the manifestation of which will follow the second **ἐπιφάνεια.**

Ver. 2. **κήρυξον**: In 1 Tim. v. 21 **διαμαρτ.** is followed by **ἵνα** with the subj.; in 2 Tim. ii. 14 by the inf. Here the adjuration is more impassioned; hence the abruptness; this is heightened also by the aorists.

ἐπίστηθι: *Insta, Be at hand*, or *Be ready to act.* **ἐπίστ. εὐκ. ἀκ.** qualifies adverbially **κήρυξον**; while the following imperatives, **ἔλεγξον, κ.τ.λ.**, are various departments of "preaching the word".

εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως: *opportune, importune* (Vulg.). So few **καιροί** remain available (see next verse), that you must use them all. Do not ask yourself, "Is this a suitable occasion for preaching?" Ask rather, "Why should not this be a suitable occasion?" "Have not any limited season; let it always be thy season, not only in peace and security and when sitting in the Church" (Chrys.).

Similar expressions are cited by Bengel, *e.g.*, *digna indigna; praesens absens; nolens volens.* We need not ask whether the reasonableness, etc., has reference to the preacher or the hearers. The direction is to disregard the inclinations of both.

ἔλεγξον: Taking this in the sense *convict*, Chrys. comments thus on the three imperatives, "After the manner of physicians, having shown the wound, he gives the incision, he applies the plaister".

ἐπιτίμησον: "The strict meaning of the word is 'to mete out due measure,' but in the N.T. it is used only of censure". So Swete (on Mark i. 25), who also notes that with the exceptions of this place and Jude 9, it is limited to the Synoptists.

παρακάλεσον: See on 1 Tim. iv. 13.

ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ: This qualifies each of the three preceding imperatives; and **πάσῃ** belongs to **διδαχῇ** as well as to **μακρ.**, *with the utmost patience and the most painstaking instruction.*

διδαχῇ: "(*teaching*) seems to point more to the *act*, **διδασκαλία** (*doctrine*) to the *substance* or *result* of teaching" (Ell.). In the only other occurrence of **διδαχή** in the Pastorals, Tit. i. 9, it means *doctrine.*

Ver. 3. **ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας**: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ἰδίας: **ἴδιος** here, as constantly, has merely the force of a possessive pronoun. See on 1 Tim. iii. 4.

[i]διδασκαλίας οὐκ [k]ἀνέξονται, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας [1]ἑαυτοῖς [l]ἐπισωρεύσουσιν διδασκάλους [m]κνηθόμενοι τὴν [n]ἀκοήν, 4. καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν [n]ἀκοὴν [o]ἀποστρέψουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς [p]μύθους [q]ἐκτραπήσονται. 5. [r]σὺ [r]δὲ [s]νῆφε ἐν πᾶσιν, [t]κακοπάθησον, ἔργον ποίησον [u]εὐαγγελιστοῦ, τὴν διακονίαν σου [v]πληροφόρησον. 6. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη [w]σπένδομαι, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς [x]ἀναλύσεώς μου [2]

i Thess. ii. 13, Heb. iv. 2, v. 11, 2 Pet. ii. 8.
k Heb. xiii. 22, etc.
l Here only, not LXX.
m Here only, not LXX.
n Matt. xiii. 14 = Acts xxviii. 26 (Isa. vi. 9), 1 Cor. xii. 17, 1
o See 2 Tim. i. 15.
p See 1 Tim. i. 4.
q See 1 Tim. i. 6.
r See 1 Tim. vi. 11.
s 1 Thess. v. 6, 8, 1 Pet. i. 13, iv. 7, v. 8, not LXX.
t See 2 Tim. ii. 9.
u Acts xxi. 8, Eph. iv. 11 only, not LXX.
v Luke i. 1, 2 Tim. iv. 17.
w Phil. ii. 17 only, N.T.
x Here only, not LXX.

[1] ἐπιθυμίας τὰς ἰδίας KL. [2] ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως DKL.

ἐπισωρεύσουσιν: *coacervabunt* (Vulg.). "He shews the indiscriminate multitude of the teachers, as also their being elected by their disciples" (Chrys.).

κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν: *prurientes auribus* (Vulg.). The same general idea is expressed in **πάντοτε μανθάνοντα** (iii. 7). Their notion of a teacher was not one who should instruct their mind or guide their conduct, but one who should gratify their æsthetic sense. *Cf.* Ezek. xxxiii. 32, "Thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, &c." The desire for pleasure is insatiable, and is increased or aggravated by indulgence; hence the heaping up of those who may minister to it. Ell. quotes appropriately from Philo, *Quod Det. Pot.* 21, **ἀποκναίουσι γοῦν [οἱ σοφισταὶ] ἡμῶν τὰ ὦτα.**

Ver. 4. The ears serve as a passage through which the truth may reach the understanding and the heart. Those who starve their understanding and heart have no use for the truth, and do not, as they would say, waste hearing power on it.

μύθους: See note on 1 Tim. i. 4.

Ver. 5. **νῆφε**: *Be sober* (R.V.). *Sobrius esto* (d). *vigila* (Vulg.) [but Vulg. Clem. inserts *sobrius esto* at end of verse]. So A.V., *watch*, and Chrys. *Sober* is certainly right in 1 Thess. v. 6, 8; but in 1 Pet. i. 13, iv. 7, and perhaps v. 8, *to be watchful* or *alert* seems more appropriate.

ἔργον εὐαγγελιστοῦ: The office of evangelist is mentioned Acts xxi. 8, Eph. iv. 11. The evangelist was an itinerant preacher who had not the supervising functions of an apostle, nor the inspiration of a prophet; though both apostle and prophet did, *inter alia*, the work of evangelist. This was in all likelihood the work to which Timothy had originally been called. St. Paul here reminds him that in the faithful performance of what might seem to be subordinate duties lies the best preservative of the Church from error. Note, that the office of an episcopus is also an **ἔργον**, 1 Tim. iii. 1, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 10, Phil. ii. 30, Eph. iv. 12, 1 Thess. v. 13.

τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον: *fulfil.* According to Chrys., this does not differ from **πλήρωσον.** See Col. iv. 17, Acts xii. 25. For **διακονία**, *ministry* or service in general, see 1 Tim. i. 12.

Ver. 6. The connexion from ver. 3 seems to be this: The dangers to the Church are pressing and instant; they can only be met by watchfulness, self-sacrifice, and devotion to duty on the part of the leaders of the Church, of whom thou art one. As for me, I have done my best. My King is calling me from the field of action to wait for my reward; thou canst no longer look to me to take initiative in action. This seems to be the force of the emphatic **ἐγώ** and the connecting **γάρ.**

ἤδη σπένδομαι: *jam delibor* (Vulg.). The analogy of Phil. ii. 17, **σπένδ. ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ** (where see Lightfoot's note), is sufficient to prove that St. Paul did not regard his own death as a sacrifice. There the **θυσία** is the persons of the Philippian converts (*cf.* Rom. xii. 1, xv. 16) rendered acceptable by faith, and offered up by their faith. Here the nature of the **θυσία** is not determined, possibly not thought of, by the writer. The reason alleged by Chrys. for the absence here of the term **θυσία** is ingenious: "For the whole of the sacrifice was not offered to God, but the whole of the drink-offering was." It is immaterial to decide whether the imagery is drawn from the Jewish drink-offerings, or heathen libations. Lightfoot quotes interesting parallels from the dying words of Seneca: "stagnum calidae aquae introiit resper-

y See ver. 2. [y] ἐφέστηκεν. 7. [z] τὸν [z] καλὸν [z] ἀγῶνα [1] [z] ἠγώνισμαι, τὸν [a b] δρόμον
z See 1 Tim. vi. 12 and 1 Tim. iv. 10.
[b c] τετέλεκα, τὴν πίστιν [d] τετήρηκα· 8. [e] λοιπὸν [f] ἀπόκειταί μοι ὁ
a Acts xiii. 25.
τῆς δικαιοσύνης [g] στέφανος, ὃν ἀποδώσει μοι ὁ Κύριος ἐν [h] ἐκείνῃ
b Acts xx. 24.
[h] τῇ [h] ἡμέρᾳ, ὁ [i] δίκαιος [i] κριτής· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐμοὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσιν
c Matt. x. 23, Luke xii. 50, xviii. 31, xxii. 37, John xix. 28, 30, Acts xiii. 29, 2 Cor. xii. 9, etc. d See 1 Tim. v. 22 and vi. 14. e 2 Cor. xiii. 11, 1 Thess. iv. 1. f Col. i. 5, etc. g 1 Cor. ix. 25, Jas. i. 12, 1 Pet. v. 4, Rev. ii. 10. h See 2 Tim. i. 12. i Ps. vii. 11, 2 Macc. xii. 6, 41. k See 1 Tim. vi. 14.
τοῖς ἠγαπηκόσι τὴν [k] ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ.

[1] ἀγῶνα τὸν καλὸν DKLP.

gens proximos servorum, addita voce, *libare se liquorem illum Jovi Liberatori*" (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 64), and from Ignatius, "Grant me nothing more than that I be poured out a libation (**σπονδισθῆναι**) to God, while there is yet an altar ready" (*Rom.* 2).

τῆς ἀναλύσεως: There is no figure of speech, such as that of striking a tent or unmooring a ship, suggested by **ἀνάλυσις**. It was as common a euphemism for death as is our word *departure*. See the verb in Phil. i. 23, and, besides the usual references given by the commentators, see examples supplied by Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., v. 266. The Vulg. *resolutionis* is wrong. Dean Bernard calls attention to the "verbal similarities of expression" between this letter to Timothy and *Philippians*, written when Timothy was with St. Paul, *viz.*, **σπένδομαι, ἀνάλυσις** here and **ἀναλῦσαι**, Phil. i. 23, and the image of the race; there (Phil. iii. 13, 14) not completed, here finished, v. 7.

ἐφέστηκεν: *instat* (Vulg.), *is come* (R.V.), *is already present*, rather than *is at hand* (A.V.), which implies a postponement. For similar prescience of approaching death compare 2 Pet. i. 14.

Ver. 7. **τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγώνισμαι**: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 12. The following **τὸν δρόμον, κ.τ.λ.**, makes this reference to the games hardly doubtful.

τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα: *cursum consummavi* (Vulg.). What had been a purpose (Acts xx. 24) was now a retrospect. To say "My race is run," is not to boast, but merely to state a fact. The figure is also found in 1 Cor. ix. 24, Phil. iii. 12. The course is the race of life; we must not narrow it, as Chrys. does, to St. Paul's missionary travels.

τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα: As in ii. 21, St. Paul passes from the metaphor to the reality. For the force of **τηρέω** here, see note on 1 Tim. vi. 14; and *cf.* Rev. xiv. 12, **οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ**. The faith is a deposit, **παραθήκη**, a trust which the Apostle is now ready to render up to Him who entrusted it to him. There is no real inconsistency between the tone of this passage and that of some in earlier epistles, *e.g.*, Phil. iii. 12, *sqq.* St. Paul is merely stating what the grace of God had done for him. A man does well to be distrustful as regards his use of the years of life that may remain to him; but when the life that he has lived has been admittedly lived "in the faith which is in the Son of God" (Gal. ii. 20), mock modesty becomes mischievous ingratitude.

Ver. 8. **λοιπόν**: *For what remains.* The R.V. renders it *besides* in 1 Cor. i. 16, *moreover* in 1 Cor. iv. 2. The notion of *duration* of future time is not in the word any more than in the French *du reste*. St. Paul means here "I have nothing more to do than to receive the crown". **λοιπόν** has the sense of *in conclusion* in 2 Cor. xiii. 11, 1 Thess. iv. 1, and does not differ from **τὸ λοιπὸν** as used in Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8, 2 Thess. iii. 1; or **τοῦ λοιποῦ** as used in Gal. vi. 17, Eph. vi. 10. The meaning of **τὸ λοιπόν** in 1 Cor. vii. 29, Heb. x. 13 is *henceforth*.

ἀπόκειται: *reposita est* (Vulg.). *Cf.* Col. i. 5, **διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς**, and, for the sentiment, 1 Pet. i. 4.

ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος: The whole context demands that this should be the possessive genitive, *The crown which belongs to*, or *is the due reward of, righteousness*, the incorruptible crown of 1 Cor. ix. 25. The verbal analogies of **στέφ. τῆς ζωῆς**, James i. 12, Rev. ii. 10, and **στέφ. τῆς δόξης**, 1 Pet. v. 4, support the view that it is the gen. of apposition; but it is difficult on this supposition to give the phrase an intelligible meaning. "Good works, which are the

9. [l m] Σπούδασον [m] ἐλθεῖν [m] πρός [m] με ταχέως· 10. Δημᾶς γάρ [l] See 2 Tim. ii. 15.
με [n] ἐγκατέλιπεν [1] ἀγαπήσας [o] τὸν [o] νῦν [o] αἰῶνα, καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς [m] Tit. iii. 12.
Θεσσαλονίκην, Κρήσκης εἰς Γαλατίαν,[2] Τίτος εἰς Δαλματίαν[3]· 11. [n] Josh. i. 5, Ps. xv. (xvi.) 10, xxi. (xxii.) 1, Isa. i. 4, 2 Cor. iv. 9, Heb. x. 25, 2 Tim. iv. 16. [o] See I. Tim. vi. 17.

[1] So ℵ[D*] Ksil, most cursives; ἐγκατέλειπεν ACD[bc]FGLP, 17, 47*, one other.
[2] Γαλλίαν ℵC, 23, 31, 39, 73, 80, am*, Eus., *H. E.* iii. 4, 8.
[3] Δελματίαν C, 2, 67**, eleven others; Δερματίαν A.

fruits of Faith and follow after Justification . . . are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ" (Art. xii.). It is to be noted that στεφ. τῆς δικ. is applied to the golden fillet worn by the high priest in the *Tests. of Twelve Patriarchs*, Levi, viii. 2.

ἀποδώσει: *reddet* (Vulg.). As long as we agree to the statement that Moses ἀπέβλεπεν εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν (Heb. xi. 26), it seems trifling to dispute the retributive force of ἀπο- in this word. Of course "the reward is not reckoned as of debt, but as of grace". St. Paul could say, "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense (ἀνταποδοῦναι) . . . to you that are afflicted rest with us" (2 Thess. i. 6, 7), see also Rom. ii. 6.

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ: see on i. 12.

ὁ δίκαιος κριτής: The notion expressed in this phrase goes back to Gen. xviii. 25. For the actual words, see reff.

οὐ μόνον δὲ . . . ἀλλὰ καί: see on 1 Tim. v. 13.

τοῖς ἠγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ: The ἐπιφάνεια here meant is the Second Coming of Christ. Those who love it do not fear it, for "there is no fear in love" (1 John iv. 18); they endeavour to make themselves increasingly ready and fit for it (1 John iii. 3); when they hear the Lord say, "I come quickly," their hearts respond, "Amen; come, Lord Jesus" (Rev. xxii. 20). The perfect tense is used because their love will have continued up to the moment of their receiving the crown, or because St. Paul is thinking of them from the standpoint of the day of crowning.

Vv. 9-12. Come to me as speedily as you can. I am almost alone. Some of my company have forsaken me; others I have despatched on business. Bring Mark with you. I have use for him.

Ver. 9. ταχέως: more definitely expressed in ver. 21, "before winter".

Ver. 10. Demas had been a loyal fellow-worker of the apostle (Philem. 24; Col. iv. 14). Chrys. supposes that Thessalonica was his home. It is futile to discuss the reality or the degree of his blameworthiness. Possibly he alleged a call to Thessalonica. All we know is that St. Paul singles him out among the absent ones for condemnation.

ἐγκατέλιπεν: *dereliquit* (Vulg.), *forsook*, not merely *left*. See reff. The aorist points to a definite past occasion now in St. Paul's mind.

ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα: See 1 Tim. vi. 17. It is just possible that Bengel is right in seeing an intentional deplorable contrast ("luctuosum vide antitheton") between this expression and ver. 8.

εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην: Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, p. 247) alleges other reasons for the supposition that Demas hailed from Thessalonica, *viz.*, He "is mentioned next to Aristarchus, the Thessalonian in Philem. 24, and . . . the name Demetrius, of which Demas is a contract form, occurs twice among the list of politarchs of that city".

Κρήσκης εἰς Γαλατίαν: *sc.* ἐπορεύθη. Crescens and Titus are not reproached for their absence. This passage, with the variant Γαλλίαν (see *apparat. crit.*), is the source of all that is said about Crescens by later writers.

Γαλατίαν: That this means the Roman province, or the region in Asia Minor (so *Const. Apost.* vii. 46) is favoured by the consideration that all the other places mentioned in this context are east of Rome. On the other hand, if we assume that St. Paul had recently visited Spain (Clem. Rom. 1 *Cor.* 5; Muratorian Canon), it would naturally follow that he had visited Southern Gaul *en route*; and Crescens might plausibly be supposed to have gone to confirm the Churches there. So Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 4, Epiph. *Haeres.* li. 11, Theodore and Theodoret, h. l.

Τίτος εἰς Δαλματίαν: This statement suggests that Titus had only been a temporary deputy for St. Paul in Crete. On the spelling of the name Dalmatia in *apparat. crit.*, see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 182.

Ver. 11. Λουκᾶς: Nothing can be more natural than that "the beloved

Λουκᾶς ἐστὶν μόνος μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ. Μᾶρκον [p] ἀναλαβὼν ἄγε[1] μετὰ σεαυτοῦ· ἔστιν γάρ μοι [q] εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν. 12. Τυχικὸν δὲ ἀπέστειλα εἰς [v]Ἔφεσον. 13. τὸν [r] φελόνην ὃν [s] ἀπέλιπον[2] ἐν Τρῳάδι παρὰ Κάρπῳ ἐρχόμενος φέρε, καὶ τὰ [t] βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς [u] μεμ-

p Acts xx. 13, 14, xxiii. 31. q See 2 Tim. ii. 21. r Here only, not LXX. s 2 Tim. iv. 20, Tit. i. 5, Jude 6. t Luke iv. 17, 20, John xx. 30, xxi. 25, Gal. iii. 10, etc. u Here only, not LXX.

[1] ἄγαγε A, 31, 47, 238, five others.
[2] So ℵDKsil., many cursives; ἀπέλειπον ACFGLP.

physician" and historian should feel that he of all men was in his place beside St. Paul when the end was so nearly approaching. The **μόνος** is relative to fellow-labourers in the gospel. St. Paul had many friends in Rome (ver. 21).

Μᾶρκον: St. Paul was now completely reconciled to John Mark who had, before Col. iv. 10 was written, vindicated and justified the risk Barnabas had run in giving him a chance of recovering his character (see Acts xiii. 13, xv. 38). **ἀναλαβών**: *assume* (Vulg.). *Take up on your way*. *Assumere* is also the Latin in Acts xx. 14, xxiii. 31, but *suscipere* in xx. 13. It is implied that Mark was somewhere on the line of route between Ephesus and Rome; but we do not know the precise place.

ἄγε μετὰ σεαυτοῦ: This phrase is illustrated from the papyri by Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., v. 57.

εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν: As Mark was the **ἑρμηνευτής** of St. Peter, rendering his Aramaic into Greek, so he may have helped St. Paul by a knowledge of Latin. **διακονία**, however, does not necessarily include preaching. It is characteristic of St. Paul that he should not regard "the ministry which he had received from the Lord Jesus" as "accomplished" so long as he had breath to "testify the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 24).

Ver. 12. **Τυχικὸν δέ, κ.τ.λ.**: The **δέ** does not involve a comparison of Tychicus with Mark, as both **εὔχρηστοι** (so Ell.); but rather distinguishes the cause of Tychicus' absence from that of the others. Demas had *forsaken* the apostle; and Crescens and Titus had *gone*, perhaps on their own initiative; Tychicus had been *sent away* by St. Paul himself. For Tychicus, see Acts xx. 4, Eph. vi. 21, 22, Col. iv. 7, 8, Tit. iii. 12; and the art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

εἰς Ἔφεσον: If the emphasis in the clause lies on **ἀπέστειλα**, as has been just suggested, the difficulty of harmonising **εἰς Ἔφεσον** with the common belief that Timothy was himself in chief authority in the Church at Ephesus is somewhat mitigated. St. Paul had mentioned the places to which Demas, etc., had gone; and even on the supposition that St. Paul knew that Tychicus was with Timothy, he could not say, "I sent away Tychicus" without completing the sentence by adding the destination. This explanation must be adopted, if we suppose with Ell. that Tychicus was the bearer of *First Timothy*. If he were the bearer of *Second Timothy*, **ἀπέστειλα** can be plausibly explained as the epistolary aorist. On the other hand, there is no reason why we should assume that Timothy was at Ephesus at this time. Other local references, *e.g.*, i. 15, 18, and iv. 13 are quite consistent with a belief that he was not actually in that city. Perhaps "Do the work of an evangelist" (iv. 5) is an indication that he was itinerating.

Ver. 13. I want my warm winter cloak and my books.

τὸν φελόνην: The **φελόνης**, or **φαιλόνης**, by metathesis for **φαινόλης**, was the same as the Latin *paenula*, from which it is derived, a circular cape which fell down below the knees, with an opening for the head in the centre. (So Chrys. on Phil. ii. 30; Tert. *De orat.* xii.). The Syriac here renders it *a case for writings, a portfolio*, an explanation noted by Chrys., **τὸ γλωσσόκομον ἔνθα τὰ βιβλία ἔκειτο**. But this is merely a guess suggested by its being coupled with **βιβλία** and **μεμβράνας**.

Τρῳάδι: Even if Timothy was not in Ephesus, he was in Asia, and travellers thence to Rome usually passed through Troas. Perhaps St. Paul had been arrested at Troas, and had not been allowed to take his cloak, etc. This is a more plausible supposition than that he was making a hurried flight from Alexander, as Lock conjectures, Hastings' *D. B.*, iv. 775, *a*.

Κάρπῳ: See art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

τὰ βιβλία would be papyrus rolls in use for ordinary purposes, while the

βράνας. 14. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ [v]χαλκεὺς πολλά μοι κακὰ [w]ἐνεδείξατο· —ἀποδώσει[1] αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ·—15. ὃν καὶ σὺ [x]φυλάσσου, [y]λίαν γὰρ [z]ἀντέστη[2] τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις. 16. Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου [a]ἀπολογίᾳ οὐδείς μοι [b]παρεγένετο,[3] ἀλλὰ πάντες

v Here only, N.T.
w Gen. l. 15, 17, etc., 2 Cor. viii. 24, Tit. ii. 10, iii. 2, Heb. vi. 10, 11.

x Luke xii. 15, Acts xxi. 25, 2 Pet. iii. 17. y Matt. (4), Mark (4), Luke (1), 2 John 4, 3 John 3.
z See 2 Tim. iii. 8. a Acts xxii. 1, xxv. 16, 1 Cor. ix. 3, 2 Cor. vii. 11, Phil. i. 7, 16, 1 Pet. iii. 15.
b Acts v. 21, xxi. 18, xxiii. 35, xxiv. 24, xxv. 7.

[1] So ℵACDFG, 17, 31, 37, 67**, 80, 108, nine others, f, g, vgclem., go., syrpesh, boh. arm.; ἀποδῴη DcK(δωει)L, most cursives, d, e, am., fuld.

[2] ἀνθέστηκε ℵcDcKLP. [3] συμπαρεγένετο ℵcDKLP.

more costly μεμβράναι contained, in all likelihood, portions of the Hebrew Scriptures, hence μάλιστα (see Kenyon, *Textual Crit. of N. T.* p. 22). We know that St. Paul employed in study the enforced leisure of prison (Acts xxvi. 24). We may note that, like Browning's Grammarian, he did not allow his normal strenuous life to be affected or diverted by the known near approach of death.

Vv. 14, 15. Beware of Alexander the smith.

Ver. 14. **Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χαλκεύς**: It is probable that this is the Alexander mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20, and it is possible that he may be the Jew of that name who was unwillingly prominent in the riot at Ephesus (Acts xix. 33, 34).

χαλκεύς: does not mean that he worked only in copper. The term came to be used of workers in any kind of metal (see Gen. iv. 22, LXX).

πολλά μοι κακὰ ἐνεδείξατο: *Multa mala mihi ostendit* (Vulg.). His *odium theologicum* expressed itself in deeds as well as in words. For this use of **ἐνδείκνυμαι**, compare reff. Moulton and Milligan (*Expositor*, vii., vii. 282) cite from a papyrus of ii. A.D. **πᾶσαν πίστιν μοι ἐνδεικνυμένῃ**.

ἀποδώσει: The future indic. is certainly attested by a greater weight of external evidence than the optative. The moral question raised by the clause is quite independent of the mood and tense used: it is, Was the future punishment of Alexander, which St. Paul considered equitable, a matter of more satisfaction than distress to the apostle? The answer would seem to be, Yes. And, provided that no element of personal spite intrudes, such a feeling cannot be logically condemned. If God is a moral governor; if sin is a reality; those who know themselves to be on God's side cannot help a feeling of joy in knowing that evil will not always triumph over good. The sentiment comes from Deut. xxxii. 35, as quoted in Rom. xii. 19, **ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω**. The exact wording is found in Ps. lxi. (lxii.) 13, **σὺ ἀποδώσεις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ**. *Cf.* Ps. xxvii. (xxviii.) 4; Prov. xxiv. 12.

Ver. 15. **φυλάσσου**: For this sense of **φυλάσσω** with a direct object, see reff. We infer that Alexander was in Timothy's vicinity.

ἡμετέροις λόγοις: The **λόγοι** were expressions of doctrine common to all Christians with St. Paul; hence **ἡμετέροις**.

Vv. 16-18. I have spoken of my present loneliness. Yet I have no justification for depression; for since I came to Rome I have had experience, at my preliminary trial, that God is a loyal protector when earthly friends fail. And so I have good hope that He will bring me safe through every danger to His heavenly kingdom.

Ver. 16. The reference in *my first defence* seems at first sight somewhat uncertain, since ver. 17 states the issue of that "defence" to have been that "the message was fully proclaimed, and all the Gentiles heard it". This would agree with the circumstances of the trials before Felix and Festus, a direct result of which was that Paul was enabled to "bear witness also at Rome" (Acts xxiii. 11). On this view, the apostle would be recalling a signal past instance in which God had overruled evil for good. On the other hand, it is a fatal objection to this reference of the phrase that when he was at Cæsarea he seems to have been kindly treated by his friends as well as by the officials. And, moreover, the sentence reads like a piece of fresh information. This latter consideration is also an argument against referring it to the first Roman imprisonment (as Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 22), though the very similar sentiments of Phil. i. 12, 13, render the identification

c See ver. 10. με [c] ἐγκατέλιπον [1]·—μὴ αὐτοῖς [d] λογισθείη.—17. ὁ δὲ Κύριός μοι
d Rom. ii. 26, iv. passim., 2 Cor. v. 19, Gen. xv. 6, Ps. xxxi. (xxxii.) 2.
παρέστη καὶ [f] ἐνεδυνάμωσέν με, ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ [g] τὸ [g] κήρυγμα [h] πληρο-
φορηθῇ καὶ ἀκούσωσιν [2] πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· καὶ [i] ἐρύσθην ἐκ στόματος
λέοντος.[3] 18. [j] ῥύσεταί με ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς [k] ἔργου [k] πονηροῦ

e Acts xxvii. 23, Rom. xvi. 2. f See 1 Tim. i. 12. g 1 Cor. i. 21, Tit. i. 3. h See ver.
i See 2 Tim. iii. 11. k John iii. 19, vii. 7, Col. i. 21, 1 John iii. 12.

[1] So ℵD*Ksil., most cursives; ἐγκατέλειπον ACD^{bc}FGLP.
[2] ἀκούσῃ KL. [3] Ins. καὶ D^{c}Fgr GKLP, g, syrr.

plausible. But in this latter case again the language of *Philippians* has no traces of forsakenness. We decide therefore that St. Paul is here referring to the preliminary investigation (*prima actio*) which he underwent after he arrived at Rome a prisoner for the second time, and which resulted in his remand. He was now writing to Timothy during the interval between his remand and the second, and final, trial. But if we thus explain "my first defence," how are we to interpret **ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ, κ.τ.λ.**? The explanation will be suggested by a comparison of such passages as Rom. xv. 19, "From Jerusalem, and round about even unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ"; Col. i. 23, "The gospel which . . . was preached in all creation". We annex a territory by the mere act of planting our country's flag on a small portion of its soil; so in St. Paul's thought a single proclamation of the gospel might have a spiritual, almost a prophetical, significance, immeasurably greater than could be imagined by one who heard it. "Una sæpe occasio maximi est momenti" (Bengel). It is to be noted too that **παρέστη** and **ἐνεδυνάμωσεν** refer to the occasion of the "first defence," and St. Paul does not say that the Lord set him free; so that we are obliged to explain **ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ, κ.τ.λ.** of St. Paul's bold assertion of his faith in Christ on that occasion, which however was a public one, not like his previous private teaching to those who came to him "in his own hired dwelling" (Acts xxviii. 30).

παρεγένετο: *adfuit* (Vulg.), *supported me as "advocatus"*. The verb is used of appearing in a court of justice in reff. It simply means *to come* or *arrive* in 1 Cor. xvi. 3. This complaint is difficult to reconcile with ver 21. Perhaps here St. Paul is referring to old friends on whom he had a special claim.

Ver. 17. **παρέστη**: *The Lord was my "patronus," cf.* Rom. xvi. 2. But the word is used in a purely local sense of the felt presence of a Divine Being in reff. in Acts.

ἐνεδυνάμωσεν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 12.

πληροφορηθῇ: *impleatur* (Vulg.). As long as there had been no public proclamation of the gospel by Paul himself in Rome, the function of **κῆρυξ** had not been completely fulfilled by him.

ἐρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος: This is most naturally understood as an echo of Ps. xxi.(xxii.) 22, **σῶσόν με ἐκ στόματος λέοντος. ῥῦσαι** occurs in the verse preceding. And what follows in the LXX seems to point to the most satisfactory explanation of the apostle's meaning, **καὶ ἀπὸ κεράτων μονοκερώτων τὴν ταπείνωσίν μου. διηγήσομαι τὸ ὄνομα σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, κ.τ.λ.** If St. Paul had not been strengthened to complete his **κήρυγμα**, his failure would have been his **ταπείνωσις**. As it was, he was delivered from that calamity, and enabled to declare God's name to the Gentiles. It is impossible, in view of **ἤδη σπένδομαι** (ver. 6), to suppose that delivery from death is implied. **πρώτῃ** (ver. 16) proves that the apostle was aware that a second trial was awaiting him, the issue of which he knew would be his execution. It is still more impossible to suppose that literal wild beasts are meant. Paul's Roman citizenship secured him from that degradation. The Greek commentators take "the lion" to mean Nero, "from his ferocity" (Chrys.). *Cf.* Esth. xiv. 13, of Ahasuerus; Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 6, 10, of Tiberius. It is no objection to this exegesis that the article is omitted before **λέοντος**, since, as we have seen, there is none in the Psalm. But deliverance from that lion's mouth would be equivalent to acquittal by the Roman government; and it is evident that St. Paul was well aware that his sentence had been only deferred.

Ver. 18. **ἔργου πονηροῦ**: The form of the clause may be modelled on the peti-

καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν. l See ver. 13. m See 2 Tim. ii. 15.

19. Ἄσπασαι Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν καὶ τὸν Ὀνησιφόρου οἶκον. 20. Ἔραστος ἔμεινεν ἐν Κορίνθῳ· Τρόφιμον δὲ [1]ἀπέλιπον[1] ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἀσθενοῦντα. 21. [m]σπούδασον πρὸ χειμῶνος ἐλθεῖν.

[1] So ℵDFGKsil., most cursives; ἀπέλειπον CLP, 17, 31, 47*, one other.

tion in the Lord's Prayer, ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ; but the addition of ἔργου proves that the deliverance spoken of is not from an external Evil Personality, but from a possible evil deed of the apostle's own doing. The expression has always a subjective reference. See reff. This exegesis is in harmony with the view taken above of "the mouth of the lion". Failure to be receptive of the strengthening grace of the Lord would have been, in St. Paul's judgment, an "evil deed," though others might easily find excuses for it. Chrys. takes a similar view of ἔργου πονηροῦ, but gives it a wider application: "He will yet again deliver me from every sin, that is, He will not suffer me to depart with condemnation". This view is also supported by what follows, σώσει, κ.τ.λ. At one moment the apostle sees the crown of righteousness just within his grasp, at another, while no less confident, he acknowledges that he could not yet be said "to have apprehended".

σώσει εἰς: *shall bring me safely to, salvum faciet* (Vulg.). "Dominus est et Liberator, 1 Thess., i. 10, et Salvator, Phil. iii. 20" (Bengel).

βασιλείαν . . . ἐπουράνιον: That the Father's kingdom is also the Son's is Pauline doctrine. ἐπουράνιος became a necessary addition to βασιλεία as it became increasingly evident that the kingdom of heaven which we see is very different from the kingdom of heaven to be consummated hereafter. It is difficult not to see a connexion between this passage and the doxology appended in primitive times to the Lord's Prayer, ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

ᾧ ἡ δόξα: The doxology, unmistakably addressed to Christ, need only cause a difficulty to those who maintain that "God blessed for ever" in Rom. ix. 5 cannot refer to Christ, because St. Paul was an Arian. Yet Rom. xvi. 27, 1 Pet. iv. 11, not to mention 2 Pet. iii. 18, Rev. i. 6, v. 13, are other examples of doxologies to the Son.

Vv. 19-22. Final salutations.

Ver. 19. Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν: The same unusual order, the wife before the husband, is found in Rom. xvi. 3, Acts xviii. 18, 26, but not in Acts xviii. 2, 1 Cor. xvi. 19. "Probably Prisca was of higher rank than her husband, for her name is that of a good old Roman family [the Acilian gens]. Aquila was probably a freedman. The name does indeed occur as *cognomen* in some Roman families; but it was also a slave name, for a freedman of Maecenas was called (C. Cilnius) Aquila" (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 268, 269; see also Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 118 *sqq.*).

τὸν Ὀνησιφόρου οἶκον: Their names are inserted after Ἀκύλαν from the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, by the cursives 46 and 109: Λέκτραν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ Σιμαίαν καὶ Ζήνωνα τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 20. Ἔραστος ἔμεινεν: The name Erastus is too common to make probable the identification of this companion of St. Paul's and the οἰκονόμος, treasurer, of Corinth, who joins in the apostle's salutation in Rom. xvi. 23. It is not antecedently likely that a city official could travel about as a missionary. On the other hand, it is probable that this Erastus is the same as the companion of Timothy mentioned in Acts xix. 22. It is to be observed that St. Paul here resumes from ver. 12 his explanation of the absence from Rome of members of his company whose presence with their master at this crisis would have been natural. It is possible that Erastus and Trophimus were with St. Paul when he was arrested the second time, and that they remained in his company as far as Miletus and Corinth respectively.

Τρόφιμον: See Acts xx. 4, xxi. 29, and the art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

ἀσθενοῦντα: Paley's remark is never out of date, "Forgery, upon such an occasion, would not have spared a miracle" (*Horae Paul.* Philippians 2). Chrys. notes, "The apostles could not do everything, or they did not dispense miraculous gifts upon all occasions, lest more should be ascribed to them than was right".

Ver. 21. πρὸ χειμῶνος: "That thou

Ἀσπάζεταί σε Εὔβουλος καὶ Πούδης καὶ Λίνος καὶ Κλαυδία καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες.[1] **22. Ὁ Κύριος**[2] **μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου. ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν.**[3]

[1] Om. **πάντες** ℵ*, 17.

[2] So, **ὁ Κύριος**, ℵ*FgrG, 17, one other, g; ins. **Ἰησοῦς** A, 31, one other; ins. **Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς** ℵcCDKLP, d, e, f, vg., syrr., boh., arm.

[3] Ins. **ἀμήν** ℵcDKLP, d, e, vg., syrr.; add **πρὸς Τιμόθεον** ℵC, 17; **πρὸς Τ. β' ἐπληρώθη** D; **ἐτελέσθη πρ. Τ. β'** FG; **πρ. Τ. β' ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας** A; **πρ. Τ. β' ἐγράφει ἀπὸ Ῥώμης** P; **πρ. Τ. δευτέρα · τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα · ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, ὅτε ἐκ δευτέρου παρέστη Παῦλος τῷ Καίσαρι Ῥώμης Νέρωνι** K, many cursives, similarly L.

be not detained," sc. by storm (Chrys.). This seems less urgent than **ταχέως** of ver. 9, and we may infer that St. Paul did not expect his final trial to take place for some months.

Εὔβουλος: Nothing else is known of this good man.

Πούδης καὶ Λίνος καὶ Κλαυδία: Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. pp. 76-79) has an exhaustive discussion of the various ingenious theories which, starting with the assumption that Pudens and Claudia were man and wife—a supposition opposed by the order of the names—have identified them with (1) Martial's congenial friend Aulus Pudens, to whom the poet casually "imputes the foulest vices of heathenism," and his bride Claudia Rufina, a girl of British race (*Epigr.* iv. 13, xi. 53), (2) "a doubtful Pudens and imaginary Claudia" who have been evolved out of a fragmentary inscription found at Chichester in 1722. This appears to record the erection of a temple by a Pudens with the sanction of Claudius Cogidubnus, who is probably a British king who might have had a daughter, whom he might have named Claudia, and who might have taken the name Rufina from Pomponia, the wife of Aulus Plautius, the Roman commander in Britain. This last supposition would identify (1) and (2). It should be added that in *Const. Apost.* vii. 46 she is mother of Linus. See also arts. *Claudia* and *Pudens* in Hastings' *D. B.*

Linus is identified by Irenæus with the Linus whom SS. Peter and Paul consecrated first Bishop of Rome (*Haer.* iii. 3). See also art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

Ver. 22. **μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου**: This expression, with **ὑμῶν** for **σου**, occurs in Gal. vi. 18, Philem. 25; but in both those places it is "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with," etc. Here a very close personal association between the Lord and Timothy is prayed for. Dean Bernard compares the conclusion of the Epistle of Barnabas, **ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης καὶ πάσης χάριτος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν.**

μεθ' ὑμῶν: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 21.

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΤΟΝ

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ δοῦλος Θεοῦ, [a] ἀπόστολος δὲ [a] Ἰησοῦ [a] Χριστοῦ [1] κατὰ πίστιν [b] ἐκλεκτῶν [b] Θεοῦ καὶ [c] ἐπίγνωσιν [c] ἀληθείας [d] τῆς [d] κατ' [d e] εὐσέβειαν 2. ἐπ' [f] ἐλπίδι [f g] ζωῆς [f g] αἰωνίου, ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ

a See 1 Tim. i. 1.
b Rom. viii. 33, Col. iii. 12.
c See 1 Tim. ii. 4.
d 1 Tim. vi. 3.
e See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
f Tit. iii. 7.
g See 1 Tim. i. 16.

[1] Χριστ. Ἰησ. A, 108, two others, fuld., boh., syrhcl; om. Ἰησοῦ Dgr*.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1-4. Salutation, in which the place of the Gospel in eternity and in time is largely expressed.

Ver. 1. **δοῦλος θεοῦ**: The only parallel to this phrase in the opening formula of any other epistle in the N.T. is James i. 1; but there it is, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." It is no less obvious than necessary to note that this variation from St. Paul's formula **δοῦλος Ἰησ. Χρ.** (Rom. i. 1; Phil. i. 1) would not be likely in a pseudepigraphic writing.

ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: See note on 1 Tim. i. 1. The **δέ** is not merely copulative, as in Jude 1; but marks the antithesis between the two aspects of Paul's relationship to the Supreme: between God as known to his fathers, and as recently manifested in the sphere of history.

κατὰ πίστιν κ.τ.λ.: to be connected with **ἀπόστολος** only. It is natural to suppose that **κατά** has the same force here as in 2 Tim. i. 1, **κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς**, where see note. His apostleship was *for the confirmation of the faith of God's elect, and for the spreading of the knowledge*, etc., etc. We take **κατά** as = *for* or *in regard to*; and expand it according to the exigencies of the context. Here *God's elect* does not mean those whom God intends to select; but those who have been externally selected, and who consequently possess faith. See reff. and Acts xiii. 48. They do not need that it should be generated in them, but that it should be fostered. See note on 2 Tim. ii. 10. Contrast **ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν**, Rom. i. 5, where the Gospel-propagation function of his apostleship is indicated.

The rendering here of the Vulg. and of the English versions, *according to the faith*, etc., *secundum fidem*, preserves the common meaning of **κατά**, but does not stand examination. St. Paul's office as apostle was not dependent in any way on the faith or knowledge of human beings, as it was on the will or command of God or Christ. The final cause of it was the faith and knowledge of men.

ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας: See on 1 Tim. ii. 4.

εὐσέβειαν: See on 1 Tim. ii. 2.

Ver. 2. **ἐπ' ἐλπίδι κ.τ.λ.**: This is best taken in connexion with the preceding clause, **κατὰ πίστιν . . . εὐσέβειαν**. The faith and the knowledge there spoken of have as their basis of action, or energy, the hope of eternal life. *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 16. Compare the use of **ἐπ' ἐλπίδι** in Acts xxvi. 6; Rom. iv. 18, viii. 20; 1 Cor. ix. 10. On the other hand, we must not exclude a remoter connexion with **ἀπόστολος**. A comparison of the parallel passage in 2 Tim. i. 1 suggests that the succession of clauses here, **κατὰ πίστιν . . . κηρύγματι**, is a full and detailed expansion of **κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν . . . ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.**

ἀψευδής: *qui non mentitur*. See note on 2 Tim. ii. 13.

ἐπηγγείλατο: See Rom. i. 1, iv. 21; Gal. iii. 19.

ἐπηγγείλατο . . . πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, ἐφανέρωσεν δέ: The same antithesis is expressed in 2 Tim. i. 9, 10 (*q.v.*); Rom.

h Wisd. vii. 17 only. h ἀψευδὴς Θεὸς i πρὸ i χρόνων i αἰωνίων, 3. k ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ l καιροῖς
i See 2 Tim. i. 9. l ἰδίοις τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν m κηρύγματι ὃ n ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ o κατ᾽
k Rom. xvi. 26, Col. i. 26, 2 Tim. i. 10, see 1 Tim. iii. 16 *note*. o ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ p σωτῆρος p ἡμῶν p Θεοῦ, 4. Τίτῳ q γνησίῳ r τέκνῳ
κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν· χάρις καὶ l εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ
s Χριστοῦ s Ἰησοῦ 2 s τοῦ s σωτῆρος s ἡμῶν.
l See 1 Tim. ii. 6. 5. t Τούτου t χάριν u ἀπέλιπόν 3 σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, ἵνα τὰ v λείποντα
m See 2 Tim. iv. 17. n See 1 Tim. i. 11. o See 1 Tim. i. 1. p See 1 Tim. i. 1. q See 1 Tim. i. 2. r See 1 Tim. i. 2. s See 2 Tim. i. 10. t Eph. iii. 1, 14, see 1 Tim. v. 14. u See 2 Tim. iv. 13. v Luke xviii. 22, Tit. iii. 13, Jas. i. 4, 5, ii. 15.

[1] ἔλεος ACᵇKL, syrʰcl. [2] Κυρίου Ἰησ. Χριστ. DᶜFGKLP, f, g, syrr. [3] κατέλιπόν ℵᶜDᶜK[LP, κατέλειπον].

xvi. 25; Col. i. 26. From different points of view, one may say that eternal life was promised, and given, to man in Christ before times eternal; though the revelation of this purpose and grace could not be made until man was prepared to receive it, **καιροῖς**, at seasons, occasions, epochs of time as relative to man's comprehension.

Ver. 3. **ἐφανέρωσεν τὸν λόγον**: For **φανερόω** see note on 1 Tim. iii. 16. We must observe that no N.T. writer speaks of a manifestation of the *gift* of eternal life (1 John i. 2 refers to the *personal* Incarnate Life). God's message concerning it, which is the revelation of a divine secret purpose, is manifested. See Col. iv. 4 in addition to the last reff. given on **ἐπηγγείλατο**. **περὶ ἧς** may be supplied bef. **ἐφανέρωσεν** (von Soden).

καιροῖς ἰδίοις: See on 1 Tim. ii. 6 and vi. 15. The rendering *his own seasons* suits the context here.

τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι: Note the distinction here indicated between the substance of the revelation (**λόγος**) given by God, and the form of it as expressible (**κήρυγμα**) by the human preacher. It is parallel to the use of **λόγος** and **λαλία** in John viii. 43.

ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ has **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κ.τ.λ.** as its antecedent in 1 Tim. i. 11, where see note.

κατ᾽ ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ: See note on 1 Tim. i. 1. There the order is **θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν**. Here **θεοῦ** is epexegetical of **σωτῆρος ἡμῶν**, as **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ** is in chap. ii. 13. **κατ᾽ ἐπιταγὴν** is to be taken with **ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ**, which is another way of expressing the notion of **ἀπόστολος**. On **σωτήρ** as a title of God, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 4.

Ver. 4. **γνησίῳ τέκνῳ**: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2.

κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν, like **ἐν πίστει** in 1 Tim. i. 2, qualifies **τέκνῳ**, but is less ambiguous than **ἐν πίστει**. It must not be restricted to a faith shared only by St. Paul and Titus; but, like the **κοινὴ σωτηρία** (Jude 3), it is common to all Christians who "have obtained a like precious faith with us" (2 Pet. i. 1).

χάρις κ.τ.λ.: See on 1 Tim. i. 2.

σωτῆρος: for the more usual **κυρίου**, 1 Tim. i. 2, 2 Tim. i. 2. The Father and the Son are here co-ordinated as Saviours.

Vv. 5-9. As I left you in Crete to carry out completely the arrangements for the organisation of the Church there, which I set before you in detail, let me remind you of the necessary qualifications of presbyters [since the presbyter is the basal element in the Church Society].

Ver. 5. **ἀπέλιπον**: The force of **ἀπολείπω** here will be apparent if we compare 2 Tim. iv. 13, 20. It means *to leave behind temporarily* something or someone; **καταλείπω** is often used of a permanent leaving behind. St. Paul's language favours the supposition that the commission given to Titus was that of a temporary apostolic legate rather than of a permanent local president.

ἐπιδιορθώσῃ: It is possible that **ἐπί** has here its original force, so as to imply that St. Paul had begun the correction of deficiencies in the Cretan Church, and that Titus was to carry it still further. (So Bengel.) It seems to have been taken in this sense by A.V.m., which renders **τὰ λείποντα** *things that are left undone*. If we may judge from this letter, Christianity was at this time in a very disorganised state in Crete. Titus is to ordain presbyters, as the foundation of a ministry; whereas the task committed to Timothy at Ephesus was to

[w] ἐπιδιορθώσῃ,[1] καὶ [x] καταστήσῃς [y] κατὰ [y] πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, ὡς ἐγώ σοι [z] διεταξάμην· 6. εἴ τίς ἐστιν [a] ἀνέγκλητος, [b] μιᾶς [b] γυναικὸς [b] ἀνήρ, τέκνα ἔχων πιστὰ μὴ ἐν [c] κατηγορίᾳ [d] ἀσωτίας ἢ [e] ἀνυπότακτα. 7. δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον [a] ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς Θεοῦ [f] οἰκονόμον, μὴ [g] αὐθάδη, μὴ [h] ὀργίλον, μὴ [i] πάροινον, μὴ [i] πλήκτην, μὴ [k] αἰσχροκερδῆ, 8. ἀλλὰ [l] φιλόξενον, [m] φιλάγαθον, [n] σώφρονα, δίκαιον, [o] ὅσιον,

w Here only, not LXX. x Matt. xxiv. 45, 47 (= Luke xii. 42, 44), xxv. 21, 23, Acts vi. 3, Heb. v. 1, vii. 28, viii. 3.

y Luke viii. 1, 4, Acts xv. 21, xx. 23. z 1 Cor. vii. 17, ix. 14, xi. 34, xvi. 1. a See 1 Tim. iii. 10. b 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12. c See 1 Tim. v. 19. d Eph. v. 18, 1 Pet. iv. 4, *cf.* Luke xv. 13. e See 1 Tim. i. 9. f 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2, 1 Pet. iv. 10. g 2 Pet. ii. 10 only, N.T. h Here only, N.T. i See 1 Tim. iii. 3. k See 1 Tim. iii. 8. l See 1 Tim. iii. 2. m Wisd. vii. 22 only, *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 3. n See 1 Tim. iii. 2. o See 1 Tim. ii. 8.

[1] **ἐπιδιορθώσῃς** AD*FG (D* **ἐπανορθωσῃς**; FG **δειορθωσῃς**).

continue the organisation of presbyters (*episcopi*) and deacons which was already in full working order. It is significant that **καθίστημι** is used of the institution of a new order of ministry in Acts vi. 3. **καί** introduces the chief point in the **ἐπιδιόρθωσις**.

κατὰ πόλιν: *in every city*. See reff. The number of presbyters is not specified; the meaning is that the order of presbyters should be established all over the island.

σοι διεταξάμην: *disposui tibi* (Vulg.), appropriately used of a number of specific directions on one general subject. Compare Acts xxiv. 23, where the verb is used in reference to three distinct instructions given to the centurion in reference to Paul.

Ver. 6. **ἀνέγκλητος**: See notes on 1 Tim. iii. 2, 10.

μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ: See on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

τέκνα πιστά: It must be supposed that a Christian father who has unbelieving children is himself a recent convert, or a very careless Christian. The fact that St. Paul did not think it necessary to warn Timothy that such men were not eligible for the presbyterate is a proof that Christianity was at this time more firmly established in Ephesus than in Crete.

μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας ἢ ἀνυπότακτα: It is significant that the moral requirements of the pastor's children are more mildly expressed in 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12. There it is the father's power to keep order in his own house that is emphasised; here the submission of the children to discipline and restraint.

Ver. 7. **τὸν ἐπίσκοπον**: On the use of the singular as a generic term see on 1 Tim. iii. 2. Here, where the thought is of the various official functions of the minister, the official title is appropriate.

ἀνέγκλητον: See notes on 1 Tim. iii. 2, 10.

θεοῦ οἰκονόμον: a steward appointed by God (Luke xii. 42; 1 Cor. ix. 17), in the house of God (1 Tim. iii. 15), to dispense His mysteries and manifold grace (1 Cor. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10). **θεοῦ** is emphatic, suggesting that the steward of such a Lord should conform to the highest ideal of moral and spiritual qualifications.

αὐθάδη: *self-assertive, arrogant*. Vulg. has here *superbum*, but more accurately in 2 Pet. ii. 10, *sibi placentes*.

ὀργίλον: *passionate, iracundum* (Vulg.). The **ὀργίλος** is one who has not his passion of anger under control.

πάροινον, πλήκτην: See on 1 Tim. iii. 3.

μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ: This negative quality is required in deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 8. Persons who are concerned in the administration of small sums must be such as are above the commission of petty thefts. There are no regulations here laid down for deacons; so we are entitled to conclude that in Crete, at this time, presbyters performed the duties of every Church office. Hence they should have the appropriate diaconal virtue. See note on 1 Tim. iii. 8. On the other hand, it may be objected against this inference that in 1 Pet. v. 2 **μὴ αἰσχροκερδῶς** is used of the spirit of the ideal presbyter.

Ver. 8. **φιλόξενον**: See on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

φιλάγαθον: In Wisd. vii. 22, the **πνεῦμα** which is in **σοφία** is **φιλάγαθον**, *loving what is good*. The epithets which immediately precede and follow **φιλάγαθον** in Wisd. have no reference to persons, with the exception of **φιλάνθρωπον**. It seems best, with the R.V., to give the words as wide a reference as possible; see on **ἀφιλάγαθοι**, 2 Tim. iii. 3.

p Here only, N.T., *cf.* Acts xxiv. 25, Gal. v. 23, 2 Pet. i. 6, 1 Cor. vii. 9, ix. 25.
q Matt. vi. 24 = Luke xvi. 13, 1 Thess. v. 14, Isa. lvi. 4.
r See 1 Tim. i. 15.
s See 2 Tim. i. 12.
t 1 Tim. i. 10 (*g.v.*), 2 Tim. iv. 3, Tit. ii. 1.
u Acts xiii. 45, xxviii. 19, 22, Tit. ii. 9.
v See 1 Tim. i. 9.
w Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 6.
x Here only, not LXX, but *cf.* Gal. vi. 3.
y Acts x. 45, xi. 2, Gal. ii. 12, Col. iv. 11.
z Here only, not LXX.
a See 2 Tim. ii. 18.

[1] Ins. καὶ DFGKL, d, e, f, g, vg. [2] Ins. δὲ CDgr.
[3] So ℵCD*, 1, 17, one other; om. τῆς ADcFGKLP.

σώφρονα: See notes on 1 Tim. ii. 9 and iii. 2.

ἐγκρατῆ: The noun **ἐγκράτεια** occurs Acts xxiv. 25; Gal. v. 23; 2 Pet. i. 6, where to the rendering *temperance* the R.V.m. gives the alternative *self-control*. The verb **ἐγκρατεύομαι** in 1 Cor. vii. 9 is *to have continency*, but in 1 Cor. ix. 25 *to be temperate* generally. The word differs from **σώφρων** as having a reference to bodily appetites, while **σώφρων** has reference also to the desires of the mind. **ἐγκράτ.** concerns action, **σωφρ.** thought.

Ver. 9. **ἀντεχόμενον**: *holding firmly to*. **ἀντέχομαι** is stronger than **ἔχειν**, as used in a similar connexion, 1 Tim. i. 19, etc., etc. The R.V. *holding to* correctly suggests the notion of withstanding opposition, which is not so clearly felt in the A.V. *holding fast*. "Having care of it, making it his business" (Chrys.).

δυνατός: See note on 2 Tim. ii. 2.

τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου: *the faithful word which is in accordance with the teaching*. It is indicative of the weakening of the phrase **πιστὸς λόγος** that St. Paul strengthens and defines it here by **κατὰ τὴν διδαχήν**. It was noted on 1 Tim. i. 15 that **πιστὸς λόγος** here means the totality of the revelation given in Christ; and **ἡ διδαχή** is to be taken passively, as equivalent to **ἡ διδασκαλία**, as employed in these epistles. It is tautological to take it actively, *the word which is faithful as regards the teaching of others;* for that is expressed in what follows.

παρακαλεῖν—ἐλέγχειν: *Cf.* 2 Tim iv. 2 for this combination. The shepherd must be able to tend the sheep, and to drive away wolves.

ὑγιαινούσῃ: See on 1 Tim. i. 10. **διδασκαλία** here, as frequently, is a body of doctrine. So R.V., *in the sound doctrine*. The A.V., *by sound doctrine*, would refer to the faith as applied in its various parts to particular needs.

τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας: It is only a coincidence that where this word occurs in Acts it is in reference to *Jewish* opponents of the Gospel.

Vv. 10-16. I have just mentioned rebuke as a necessary element in a presbyter's teaching. This is especially needful in dealing with Cretan heretics, in whom the Jewish strain is disagreeably prominent. Alike in their new-fangled philosophy of purity, and in their pretensions to orthodoxy, they ring false. Purity of life can only spring from a pure mind; and knowledge is alleged in vain, if it is contradicted by practice.

Ver. 10. The persons spoken of here were Christian Jews. **οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς** (without **τῆς**, see crit. note) has this meaning in reff. (in Acts x. 45 it is qualified by the addition of **πιστοί**). Rom. iv. 12, is not really an instance of the phrase. That they were at least nominally Christians is also implied by the epithet **ἀνυπότακτοι**. We cannot call those persons *unruly* on whose obedience we have no claim.

ματαιολόγοι: **ματαιολογία** occurs in 1 Tim. i. 6.

φρεναπάται: *seductores*. The verb occurs in Gal. vi. 3.

μάλιστα: it is probable that there were very few false teachers who were not "of the circumcision".

Ver. 11. **οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν**: *quos oportet redargui, whose mouths must be stopped* by the unanswerable arguments of the orthodox controversialist. This is the result hoped for from the "conviction," of ver. 9.

ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν: *pervert whole families* (Alf.); Moulton and Milligan give an apt illustration from a papyrus of second cent. B.C., **τῆς πατ-**

τρέπουσιν διδάσκοντες [b] ἃ [b] μὴ [b] δεῖ [c] αἰσχροῦ [d] κέρδους [e] χάριν. 12. εἶπέν[1] τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, [f] ἴδιος [f] αὐτῶν προφήτης, Κρῆτες ἀεὶ [g] ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες [h] ἀργαί. 13. ἡ [i] μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής. [k] δι' [k] ἣν [k] αἰτίαν ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς [l] ἀποτόμως, ἵνα [m] ὑγιαίνωσιν [m] ἐν[2] [m] τῇ [m] πίστει, 14. μὴ [n] προσέχοντες Ἰουδαϊκοῖς

b 1 Tim. v. 13.
c 1 Cor. xi. 6, xiv. 35, Eph. v. 12, *cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 8, 1 Pet. v. 2.
d Phil. i. 21, iii. 7.
e See 1 Tim. v. 14.
f Mark xv. 20 (Tisch.), 2 Pet. iii. 3.
g See 1 Tim. i. 10.
h See 1 Tim. v. 13.
i See 1 Tim. iii. 7.
k See 2 Tim. i. 6.
l Wisd. v. 22, 2 Cor. xiii. 10, *cf.* Rom. xi. 22 only.
m Tit. ii. 2, see 1 Tim. i. 10.
n See 1 Tim. i. 4.

[1] Ins. δὲ ℵ*G, f, g, boh; ins. γὰρ 115. [2] Om. ἐν ℵ*, 47, one other.

ρικῆς οἰκίας . . . ἔτι ἔνπροσθεν ἄρδην [ἀ]νατετραμμένης δι' ἀσ[ω]τίας (*Expositor*, vii., v. 269). This suggests the rendering *upset*. The whole family would be upset by the perversion of one member of it.

ἃ μὴ δεῖ: Normally, **οὐ** is used in relative sentences with the indicative. Other exceptions will be found in 2 Pet. i. 9, 1 John iv. 3 (T.R.). It is possible that the force of **μή** here is given by translating, *which (we think) they ought not*. If the teaching had been absolutely indefensible by any one, he would have said, **ἃ οὐ δεῖ**. See Blass, *Grammar*, p. 254.

αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν: The three reff. on **αἰσχροῦ**, the only other occurrences in N.T. of this adj., are instances of the phrase **αἰσχρόν ἐστι**. The reference is to the claim to support made by itinerating or vagrant prophets and apostles such as are referred to in the *Didache*, cc. 11, 12, and alluded to in 2 Cor. xi. 9-13. All such abuses would exist in an aggravated form in Crete, the natives of which had an evil reputation for **αἰσχροκέρδεια**, according to Polybius, **ὥστε παρὰ μόνοις Κρηταιεῦσι τῶν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν νομίζεσθαι κέρδος**. (*Hist.* vi. 46. 3, cited by Ell.). They get a bad character also from Livy (xliv. 45), and Plutarch (*Paul. Aemil.* 23). The Cretans, Cappadocians, and Cilicians were **τρία κάππα κάκιστα**.

Ver. 12. **προφήτης**: It is possible that St. Paul applies this title to the author of the following hexameter line because the Cretan false teachers were self-styled prophets. There was a Cretan prophet once who told plain truths to his countrymen. The whole line occurs, according to Jerome, in the **περὶ χρησμῶν** of Epimenides, a native of Cnossus in Crete. The first three words are also found in the Hymn to Zeus by Callimachus, who is the prophet meant according to Theodoret; and the rest has a parallel in Hesiod, *Theogon.* 26, **ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἷον.** It is generally agreed that St. Paul was referring to Epimenides. This is the view of Chrys. and Epiph., as well as of Jerome. It was Epimenides at whose suggestion the Athenians are said to have erected the "anonymous altars," *i.e.*, **Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ** (Acts xvii. 23), in the course of the purification of their city from the pollution caused by Cylon, 596 B.C. He is reckoned a prophet, or predictor of the future, by Cicero, *de Divin.* i. 18, and Apuleius, *Florid.* ii. 15, 4. Plato calls him **θεῖος ἀνήρ** (*Legg.* i. p. 642 D).

ψεῦσται: The particular lie which provoked the poet's ire was the claim made by the Cretans that the tomb of *Z*eus was on their island. Here, the term has reference to **ματαιολόγοι**, etc.

γαστέρες ἀργαί: The R.V., *idle gluttons*, is more intelligible English than the A.V., *slow bellies*, but does not so adequately represent the poet's meaning. He has in his mind the belly, as it obtrudes itself on the beholder and is a burden to the possessor, not as a receptacle for food. Alf. quotes aptly Juvenal, *Sat.* iv. 107, "Montani quoque *venter* adest, abdomine tardus".

Ver. 13. **δι' ἣν αἰτίαν**: See on 2 Tim. i. 6.

ἀποτόμως: *severely*. The noun **ἀποτομία**, *severitas*, occurs Rom. xi. 22. See Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 192.

ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10. The intention of the reproof was not merely the securing of a controversial triumph, but "to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred, and are deceived". **ἵνα** expresses the object aimed at in the reproof, not the substance of it.

Ver. 14. **προσέχοντες**: see on 1 Tim. i. 4. The word implies the giving one's consent, as well as one's attention.

Ἰουδαϊκοῖς: This determines the

o 1 Tim. i. 4. p See 2 Tim. i. 15. q Luke xi. 41, Rom. xiv. 20. r John xviii. 28, Heb. xii. 15, Jude 8. s See 1 Tim. vi. 12. t See 1 Tim. v. 8. iii. 3.

[o] μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων [p] ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν.
15. [q] πάντα [1] [q] καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς· τοῖς δὲ [r] μεμιαμμένοις καὶ
ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρόν, ἀλλὰ [r] μεμίανται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ
ἡ συνείδησις. 16. Θεὸν [s] ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις
[t] ἀρνοῦνται, [u] βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ [v] ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς [w] πᾶν [w] ἔργον
[w] ἀγαθὸν [w x] ἀδόκιμοι.

u Prov. xvii. 15, Ecclus. xli. 5, 2 Macc. i. 27 only. v Luke i. 17, 2 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. iii. 3. w See 2 Tim. ii. 21 and 1 Tim. ii. 10. x See 2 Tim. iii. 8.

[1] Ins. μὲν ℵ[c]DcKL, syr[hcl]; ins. γὰρ boh, syr[pesh].

nature of the μῦθοι referred to in these epistles. See on 1 Tim. i. 4.

ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων: We are naturally reminded of Mark vii. 7, 8, with its antithesis between the **ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων** and **ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ,** and Col. ii. 22, where the same passage of Isaiah (xxix. 13) is echoed. But here the antithesis is not so strongly marked. The commandments are depreciated, not because their authors are men, but because they are *men who turn away from the truth*, impure men (In 1 Tim. iv. 3 "they that believe and know the truth" are men whose thoughts are pure). *The truth* here, as elsewhere in the Pastorals, is almost a Christian technical term. It can hardly be doubted that the **ἐντολαί** referred to were of the same nature as those noted in Col. ii. 22, arbitrary ascetic prohibitions.

Ver. 15. **πάντα καθαρὰ κ.τ.λ.:** This is best understood as a maxim of the Judaic Gnostics, based on a perversion of the Saying **πάντα καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστιν** (Luke xi. 41. *Cf.* Rom. xiv. 20; Mark vii. 18.). St. Paul accepts it as a truth, but not in the intention of the speaker; and answers, **τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις κ.τ.λ.** The passage is thus, as regards its form, parallel to 1 Cor. vi. 12 *sqq.*, where St. Paul cites, and shows the irrelevancy of, two pleas for licence: "All things are lawful for me," and "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats". **τοῖς καθαροῖς** is of course the *dat. commodi*, *for the use of the pure*, *in their case*, as in the parallels, Luke xi. 41, 1 Tim. iv. 3; not *in the judgment of the pure*, as in Rom. xiv. 14.

τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις, κ.τ.λ.: The order of the words is to be noted: their moral obliquity is more characteristic of them than their intellectual perversion. The satisfaction of natural bodily desires (for it is these that are in question) is, when lawful, a pure thing, not merely innocent, in the case of the pure; it is an impure thing, even when lawful, in the case of "them that are defiled". And for this reason: their intellectual apprehension (**νοῦς**) of these things is perverted by defiling associations; "the light that is in them is darkness;" and their conscience has, from a similar cause, lost its sense of discrimination between what is innocent and criminal. That any action with which they themselves are familiar could be pure is inconceivable to them. "When the soul is unclean, it thinks all things unclean" (Chrys.). The statement that the conscience can be defiled is significant. While conscientious scruples are to be respected, yet, if the conscience be defiled, its dictates and instincts are unreliable, false as are the song-efforts of one who has no ear for music.

Ver. 16. **θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι:** "*We know God*"; that was their profession of faith. They "gloried in God," Rom. ii. 17. This is an allusion to the Jewish pride of religious privilege. Weiss points out that this phrase alone is sufficient to prove that the heretics in question are not the Gnostics of the second century (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 133). See the use of the phrase in Gal. iv. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 5. Compare 2 Tim. iii. 5, "Holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof"; also 1 John ii. 4. There is here the constant antithesis between words and deeds.

τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται: Their lives give the lie to their professions; "They acted as if this Supreme Being was a mere metaphysical abstraction, out of all moral relation to human life, as if He were neither Saviour nor Judge" (J. H. Bernard *comm. in loc.*).

πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν: See note on 2 Tim. iii. 17.

ἀδόκιμοι: *worthless*, *unfit*. See note on 2 Tim. iii. 8.

II. 1. [a]Σὺ [a]δὲ λάλει ἃ [b]πρέπει τῇ [c]ὑγιαινούσῃ [c]διδασκαλίᾳ. 2. [d]πρεσβύτας [e]νηφαλίους εἶναι, [f]σεμνούς, [g]σώφρονας· [h]ὑγιαίνοντας [h]τῇ [h]πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ [i]ὑπομονῇ. 3. [k]πρεσβύτιδας [l]ὡσαύτως ἐν [m]καταστήματι [n]ἱεροπρεπεῖς,[1] μὴ [o]διαβόλους, μηδὲ[2] [p]οἴνῳ [p]πολλῷ [q]δεδουλωμένας, [r]καλοδιδασκάλους, 4. ἵνα [s]σωφρο-

a See 1 Tim. vi. 11. b See 1 Tim. ii. 10. c 1 Tim. i. 10 (*g.v.*), 2 Tim. iv. 3, Tit. i. 9. d Luke i. 18, Philem. 9. e See 1 Tim. iii. 2. f See 1 Tim. iii. 8. g See 1 Tim. iii. 2. h Tit. i. 13, see 1 Tim. i. 10. i See 1 Tim. vi. 11. k 4 Macc. xvi. 14 only. l See 1 Tim. ii. 9. m 3 Macc. v. 45 only. n 4 Macc. ix. 25, xi. 20 only. o See 1 Tim. iii. 11. p See 1 Tim. iii. 8. q Rom. vi. 18, 22, 1 Cor. vii. 15, ix. 19, Gal. iv. 3, 2 Pet. ii. 19. r Here only, not LXX. s Here only, not LXX.

[1] ἱεροπρεπεῖ CH**, 17, 31, 37, two others, d, e, f, g, m[81], vg. (*in habitu sancto*), boh., syrr. (but not syr[hcl-mg]), arm.

[2] So ℵ*AC, 73; μὴ ℵ[c]DFGHKLP, vg. See 1 Tim. iii. 8.

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-10. In the face of this immoral teaching, do you constantly impress the moral duties of the Gospel on your people of every age and class. There is an ideal of conduct appropriate to old men and old women respectively—the latter have moreover special duties in the training of the young women—and young men. Enforce your words by personal example. Slaves, too, must be taught that they share in responsibility for the good name of the Gospel.

Ver. 1. **σὺ δὲ**: See reff., and note on 1 Tim. vi. 11. Titus is to be as active in teaching positive truth as the heretics were in teaching evil.

λάλει: emphasises the importance of oral teaching.

τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ: See on 1 Tim. i. 10.

Ver. 2. The heads of moral instruction which begin here are more unmistakably intended for the laity than are the similar passages in *Tim.* That it should devolve on the apostle's legate to give popular moral instruction is perhaps another indication of the less-developed state of the Church in Crete than in Ephesus and its neighbourhood.

πρεσβύτας: *senes*; sc. **παρακάλει** (ver. 6).

νηφαλίους: *sober, sobrii; temperate* (R.V.) in respect of their use of strong drink. Chrys. explains it *to be vigilant*, as does the Syriac, and A.V. m.; but the homely warning seems more appropriate. See note on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

σεμνούς: see note on 1 Tim. iii. 8.

σώφρονας: see notes on 1 Tim. ii. 9, and iii. 2. For **ὑγιαίνειν** followed by dat. see i. 13. **πίστις, ἀγάπη, ὑπομονή** are constantly grouped together (see on 1 Tim. vi. 11); and this suggests that **πίστις** here is subjective, not objective, as in the similar phrase i. 13. See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

Ver. 3. **πρεσβύτιδας**: correlative to **πρεσβύτας**, as **πρεσβυτέρας** is to **πρεσβυτέρῳ** in 1 Tim. v. 1, 2.

ὡσαύτως: See on 1 Tim. ii. 9.

ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς: *reverent in demeanour*, R.V. **καταστολή** in 1 Tim. ii. 9 has an almost exclusive reference to dress. *Demeanour* (R.V.) is better than *behaviour* (A.V.), which has a wide reference to conduct, in all respects and on all occasions. *Deportment*, which includes a slight reference to dress, would be the best rendering, only that the word has become depreciated.

ἱεροπρεπεῖς perhaps = **ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν** (1 Tim. ii. 10); but in itself the word does not guarantee more than the appearance of reverence. Wetstein gives, among other illustrations, one from Josephus (*Ant.* xi. 8, 5), describing how Jaddua, the high priest, went out in procession from Jerusalem to meet Alexander the Great, **ἱεροπρεπῆ καὶ διαφέρουσαν τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν ποιούμενος τὴν ὑπάντησιν.**

μὴ διαβόλους: See on 1 Tim. iii. 11, and 2 Tim. iii. 3.

δεδουλωμένας: The A.V., *not given to much wine*, makes no difference between this and **προσέχοντας**, which is the verb in the corresponding phrase, in the list of moral qualifications of deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 8. It is proved by experience that the reclamation of a woman drunkard is almost impossible. The best parallel to this use of **δουλόω** is 2 Pet. ii. 19, **ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται.** *Cf.* also the other reff.

καλοδιδασκάλους: Not only "by discourse at home," as Chrys. explains, but by example.

Ver. 4. **σωφρονίζουσιν.** The only other examples of **ἵνα** with a pres. indic.

νίζουσιν [1] τὰς [t] νέας [u] φιλάνδρους εἶναι, [v] φιλοτέκνους, 5. [g] σώφρονας, ἁγνάς, [w] οἰκουργούς,[2] [x] ἀγαθάς, [y] ὑποτασσομένας [y] τοῖς [y] ἰδίοις [y] ἀνδράσιν, [z] ἵνα [z] μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ [z] βλασφημῆται. 6. τοὺς νεωτέρους [a] ὡσαύτως παρακάλει [b] σωφρονεῖν· 7. περὶ πάντα σεαυτὸν [c] παρεχόμενος [d] τύπον [e] καλῶν [e] ἔργων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ [f] ἀφθορίαν,[3]

t Positive here only in this sense.
u Here only, not LXX.
v 4 Macc. xv. 4, 5, 6, φιλοτεκνία also 4 Macc. (5) only.
w Here only, not LXX.
x Matt. xx. 15, Rom. v. 7, 1 Pet. ii. 18.
y Eph. v. 22, Col. iii. 18, 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5, *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 34, Eph. v. 24.
z See 1 Tim. vi. 1.
a See 1 Tim. ii. 9.
b Mark v. 15 (=Luke viii. 35), Rom. xii. 3, 2 Cor. v. 13, 1 Pet. iv. 7, not LXX.
c See 1 Tim. i. 4, also Acts xvii. 31, xxii. 2, xxviii. 2.
d See 1 Tim. iv. 12.
e See 1 Tim. iii. 1.
f Haggai ii. 18 (17) only.

[1] So ℵ*AFGHP, two cursives; **σωφρονίζωσι** ℵcCDKL.
[2] So ℵ*ACD*FG; **οἰκουρούς** ℵcDcHKLP, syrhcl-mg-gr.
[3] **ἀδιαφθορίαν** ℵcDcL, syrhcl-mg-gr; **ἀφθονίαν** FG.

in Paul are 1 Cor. iv. 6 (**φυσιοῦσθε**) and Gal. iv. 17 (**ζηλοῦτε**). These may be cases of an unusual formation of the subj., both being verbs in **-όω**. **γινώσκομεν**, 1 John v. 20, is another instance. *Train* is the excellent rendering of the R.V. The A.V., *teach . . . to be sober*, although an adequate rendering elsewhere, leaves **φιλάνδρους εἶναι** disconnected. Timothy is bidden (1 Tim. v. 2) **παρακαλεῖν . . . νεωτέρας** himself; but this refers to pastoral public monitions, not to private training in domestic virtues and duties, as here.

τὰς νέας: There is no other instance in the Greek Bible of **νέος**, in the positive, being applied to a young person; though it is common in secular literature. There is possibly a certain fitness in the word as applied here to recently married women, whom the apostle has perhaps exclusively in view.

φιλάνδρους: "This is the chief point of all that is good in a household" (Chrys.). One of the three things in which Wisdom "was beautified" is "a woman and her husband that walk together in agreement" (Ecclus. xxv. 1).

φιλοτέκνους: "She who loves the root will much more love the fruit" (Chrys.). **φιλάνδρῳ καὶ φιλοτέκνῳ** is cited from an "epitaph from Pergamum about the time of Hadrian" by Deissmann, who gives other references to secular literature. (*Bible Studies*, trans. p. 255 *sq.*).

Ver. 5. **οἰκουργούς**: *workers at home*. Field says that "the only authority for this word is Soranus of Ephesus, a medical writer, not earlier than the second century," **οἰκουργὸν καὶ καθέδριον διάγειν βίον**; but the verb is found in Clem. Rom., *ad Cor.* i. 1, **γυναιξίν . . . τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον σεμνῶς οἰκουργεῖν ἐδιδάσκετε**. **οἰκουρούς**, *keepers at home*, *domum custodientes* (d m[81]) *domus curam habentes* (Vulg.), though constantly found in descriptions of virtuous women, is a less obviously stimulating epithet. Mothers who work at home usually find it a more absorbing pleasure than "going about from house to house" (1 Tim. v. 13). But the "worker at home" is under a temptation to be as unsparing of her household as of herself; and so St. Paul adds **ἀγαθάς**, *benignas*, *kind* (R.V.), rather than *good* (A.V.). For this force of **ἀγαθός**, see reff.

ἰδίοις: **ἴδιος** (see on 1 Tim. iii. 4) is not emphatic: it is simply, *their husbands*. The **ἴδιος** merely differentiates *husband* from *man*.

ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ βλασφημῆται: For **λόγος**, as used here, the more usual word is **ὄνομα** (from Isa. lii. 5). See reff. on 1 Tim. vi. 1; and also Jas. ii. 7, Rev. xiii. 6, xvi. 9. **ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας**, in 2 Peter ii. 2, is equivalent to **ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ** here. The practical worth of a religion is not unfairly estimated by its effects on the lives of those who profess it. If the observed effect of the Gospel were to make women worse wives, it would not commend it to the heathen; "for the Greeks judge not of doctrines by the doctrine itself, but they make the life and conduct the test of the doctrines" (Chrys.). See note on 1 Tim. v. 14.

Ver. 6. **ὡσαύτως**: see on 1 Tim. ii. 9.

Ver. 7. **περὶ πάντα** is joined with the preceding words by Jerome and Lucifer (*ut pudici* [*sobrii*] *sint in omnibus*), followed by Tischendorf and von Soden. For this use of **περί**, see on 1 Tim. i. 19. St. Paul's usual phrase is **ἐν παντί** (fifteen times in all; ten times in 2 Cor.; not in Pastorals), or **ἐν πᾶσιν** (ten times, five of which are in the Pastorals: 1 Tim. iii.

[g] σεμνότητα,[1] 8. λόγον [h] ὑγιῆ [i] ἀκατάγνωστον, ἵνα ὁ [k] ἐξ [k] ἐναντίας [l] ἐντραπῇ μηδὲν ἔχων λέγειν [2] περὶ ἡμῶν [3] [m] φαῦλον. 9. δούλους [n] ἰδίοις [n] δεσπόταις [4] ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἐν πᾶσιν, [o] εὐαρέστους εἶναι, μὴ [p] ἀντιλέγοντας, 10. μὴ [5] [q] νοσφιζομένους, ἀλλὰ [r] πᾶσαν [r] πίστιν [6]

g See 1 Tim. ii. 2. h See 1 Tim. i. 10. i 2 Macc. iv. 47 only. k Mark xv. 39 (different application). l 2 Thess. iii. 14. m John iii. 20, v. 29, Rom. ix. 11, 2 Cor. v. 10, Jas. iii. 16. n See 1 Tim. vi. 1. o Rom. xiv. 18, 2 Cor. v. 9. p See Tit. i. 9. q Acts v. 2, 3. r 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

[1] Ins. ἀφθαρσίαν DcKL, 37, more than thirty others, syrhcl-mg gr, arm; ins. ἀγνείαν C, 80, three others, syrhcl, arm.

[2] λέγειν bef. φαῦλον KL. [3] ὑμῶν A, many cursives, boh.

[4] δεσπ. ἰδ. ADP, 238, four others, d, e, f, vg. [5] μηδὲ CbDgr*FgrGgr, 17.

[6] πίστ. πᾶσ. KL; πᾶσ. ἐνδεικ. πίστ. FgrG g; om. πίστιν ℵ*, 17.

11; 2 Tim. ii. 7, iv. 5; Tit. ii. 9, 10); also εἰς πάντα, 2 Cor. ii. 9; κατὰ πάντα, Col. iii. 20, 22.

σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον: The middle is appropriate with σεαυτὸν; see reff. given by Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 254; but with ἀφθορίαν, etc., the active would seem more natural, as in reff. For τύπον, see 1 Tim. iv. 12, and for καλὰ ἔργα, see 1 Tim. iii. 1. This exhortation, following νεωτέρους κ.τ.λ., and also ver. 15, suggest that Titus was comparatively young.

διδασκαλία here is not *doctrine* (A.V.), but *teaching; thy doctrine* (R.V.), including the person of the teacher as well as what he says. See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ἀφθορίαν, σεμνότητα, *sincerity . . . impressiveness, integritatem . . . gravitatem.* See on 1 Tim. ii. 2. These refer respectively to the principles and the manner of the teacher, while λόγον, κ.τ.λ., describes the matter of his teaching.

Ver. 8. ἀκατάγνωστον: *to which no exception can be taken.* See Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Trans. p. 200. ὑγιῆ implies the conformity of the doctrine taught with the Church's standard (see note on 1 Tim. i. 10), while ἀκατάγνωστον has reference to the manner of its presentation to the hearer.

ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας: The heathen opponent, official or unofficial, ὁ ἀντικείμενος (1 Tim. v. 14), οἱ ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι (2 Tim. ii. 25), not the Devil himself (Chrys.).

ἐντραπῇ: *vercatur* (Vulg.); but *confundatur*, as in 2 Thess. iii. 14, would be a better rendering here. An antagonist who finds that he has no case "looks foolish," as we say.

φαῦλον: usually applied to actions. See reff. The clause means *having nothing evil to report concerning us:* not, as the English versions, *having no evil thing to say*, which might be explained as, "being unable to abuse us".

Ver. 9. δούλους: sc. παρακάλει, ver. 6. For the general topic, and the term δεσπότης, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 1.

ἐν πᾶσιν: joined as in text by Jerome, Ambrosiaster and m[93] with ὑποτάσσ. It is in favour of this that ἐν πᾶσιν elsewhere in the Pastorals (see note on ver. 7) is at the end of a clause; also that in similar contexts we have ἐν παντί (Eph. v. 24) and κατὰ πάντα (Col. iii. 22) joined with ὑποτάσσω and ὑπακούω.

εὐαρέστους: A Pauline word. Alf. notes that it is a servant's phrase, like the English "to give satisfaction". This acute remark brings the present passage into harmony with St. Paul's usage in the reff., in which it is used of persons, of men in their relation to God. εὐάρεστον is used of a sacrifice, "acceptable," in Rom. xii. 1, Phil. iv. 18; *cf.* Heb. xii. 28; τὸ εὐάρεστον, "that which is well pleasing," in Rom. xii. 2, Eph. v. 10, Col. iii. 20, Heb. xiii. 21. Jerome's view that εὐαρ. is passive, "contented with their lot," is not satisfactory.

μὴ ἀντιλέγοντας; *non contradicentes* (Vulg.). Ell. thinks that more is implied than pert answers (A.V. *answering again*); rather "thwarting their masters' plans, wishes, or orders". See ch. i. 9. This is the connotation of *gainsaying* (R.V., A.V.m.).

Ver. 10. μὴ νοσφιζομένους: *non fraudantes* (Vulg.), *not purloining.* The particular form of theft implied is the abstraction or retention for oneself, of a part of something entrusted to one's care.

πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν: *displaying the utmost trustworthiness.* There is a similar phrase in ch. iii. 2,

s See 2 Tim. iv. 14. [s] ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν,[1] ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν[2] τοῦ [t] σωτῆρος
t See 1 Tim. i. 1. [t] ἡμῶν [t] Θεοῦ [u] κοσμῶσιν ἐν πᾶσιν.
u See 1 Tim. ii. 9. II. [v] Ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ [w] χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ[3] [x] σωτήριος[4] πᾶσιν
v Luke i. 79, Acts xxvii. 20, Tit. iii. 4. ἀνθρώποις 12. [y] παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα [z] ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν [a] ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς [b] κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας [c] σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ [d] εὐσεβῶς
w 2 Cor. viii. 9. i. 20. only.

x Here only, N.T., Am. v. 22, Wisd. i. 14, 3 Macc. (2), 4 Macc. (2) only. y See 1 Tim. i. 20. z See 1 Tim. v. 8. a See 2 Tim. ii. 16. b Heb. ix. 1, not LXX. c Wisd. ix. 11 only. d See 2 Tim. iii. 12.

[1] πᾶσαν ἐνδεικ. ἀγαθην ℵ*; πᾶσ. ἐνδεικ. ἀγάπην 17.
[2] Om. τὴν KLP. [3] Ins. ἡ CcDbcKLP.
[4] σωτῆρος ℵ*, τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν FG, f, g, vg. (am. om. ἡμῶν), boh.

πᾶσαν ἐνδεικ. πραΰτητα. See note on 2 Tim. iv. 14. On this use of **πᾶς**, see on 1 Tim. i. 15. **πίστιν** has a qualifying adj. elsewhere, *e.g.*, **ἀνυπόκριτος** (1 Tim. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 5. *Cf.* ch. i. 4. 2 Pet. i.; Jude 20), but the addition of another adj. after **πᾶς** is unusual. In Clem. Rom. 1 *Cor.* 26 **πίστις ἀγαθή** is rendered by Lightfoot *honest faith;* but *honest fidelity* would be an odd expression. Von Soden would give **ἀγαθή** here the sense of *kind, wishing well*, as in ver. 5, and as a contrast to **ἀντιλεγ.**, as **πίστιν** is to **νοσφ.** W.H. suggest that the original reading here was **πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγάπην.** See apparat. crit.

διδασκαλίαν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

Θεοῦ refers to God the Father. See i. 3. Von Soden takes it here as objective genitive; the **διδασκαλία** being set forth in vv. 11-14.

κοσμῶσιν: *cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 9, **κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς . . . δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.** The **διδασκαλία**, though really practical, can be plausibly alleged to be mere theory; it must then, by good works, be rendered attractive to them that are without. *Cf.* Matt. v. 16, Phil. ii. 15.

Vv. 11-15. The justification of this insistence on the universal necessity for right conduct is the all-embracing scope of the saving grace of God, which has visibly appeared as a call to repentance, a help to amendment of life, and a stimulus to hope. Christ's gift of Himself for us constrains us to give ourselves wholly to Him. Insist on these things, as authoritatively as possible, in every department of your teaching.

Ver. 11. The emphatic word is **πᾶσιν.** The connexion is with what has immediately preceded. No rank or class or type of mankind is outside the saving influence of God's grace. Chrys. concludes a striking picture of the adverse moral environment of slaves with, "It is a difficult and surprising thing that there should ever be a good slave".

ἐπεφάνη: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 14. The grace of God (also iii. 7) is His kindness and love of man (iii. 4). It appeared (iii. 4) (*a*) as a revelation, in the Incarnation, and also (*b*) in its visible results; and so it is both *heard* and *recognised* (Col. i. 6). Accordingly Barnabas could *see* it at Antioch (Acts xi. 23). It is possible to *stand fast in it* (1 Pet. v. 12), and to *continue in it* (Acts xiii. 43). It is *given* to men, to be dispensed by them to others (Rom. i. 5, Eph. iii. 2. 7); and if men do not respond to it, they are said to *fall short of it* (Heb. xii. 15). Here it is described in its essential power and range, **σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρ., . . .** *appeared, bringing salvation to all men* (so R.V.; A.V.m). This connexion of the words is favoured by the fact that **ἐπεφάνη** is used absolutely in iii. 4.

Ver. 12. **παιδεύουσα.** *erudiens* (Vulg.), *corripiens* (d). Grace is potentially **σωτήριος** as regards all men; actually its efficacy is seen in the disciplining of individuals one by one; **ἡμᾶς**, to begin with. See notes on 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 4, iv. 10. So Chrys. makes **ἵνα** depend on **ἐπεφάνη** more directly than on **παιδεύουσα**: "Christ came that we should deny ungodliness." The connexion, then, is **ἐπεφάνη . . . ἵνα . . . ζήσωμεν.** "The final cause of the Revelation in Christ is not *creed*, but *character*" (J. H. Bernard). It is of course possible (and this is the view usually held) to join **παιδεύουσα ἵνα**; the **ἵνα** introducing the object (*instructing us, to the intent that, denying*, etc., R.V.), not the content (*teaching us that denying*, etc., A.V.) of the **παιδεία.**

ἀρνησάμενοι . . . ζήσωμεν . . . προσ-

[d] ζήσωμεν ἐν [e] τῷ [e] νῦν [e] αἰῶνι, 13. [f] προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ [g] ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ [h] σωτῆρος

e See 1 Tim. vi. 17.
f Mark xv. 43, Luke ii. 25, 38, xii. 36, xxiii. 51, Acts xxiii. 21, xxiv. 15, Heb. xi. 35, Jude 21. (It means *receive* in Luke xv. 2, Rom. xvi. 2, Phil. ii. 29, Heb. x. 34.)
g See 1 Tim. vi. 14.
h See 2 Tim. i. 10.

δεχόμενοι represent three successive stages in the Christian life. The force of the aorist participle must not be lost sight of, though it may be pedantic to mark it in translation. **ἀρνησάμενοι κ.τ.λ.**, synchronises with the "death unto sin" which precedes the definite entry on newness of life, while **προσδεχόμενοι** expresses the constant mental attitude of those who are living that new life.

ἀρνησάμενοι: This indicates the renunciation of the Devil, of the vanity of this world, and of all the sinful lusts of the flesh. **ἀρνέομαι** means here *to repudiate, renounce all connexion with. Cf.* **ἀποθέμενοι**, 1 Pet. ii. 1. See on 1 Tim . v. 8.

τὴν ἀσέβειαν: **εὐσέβεια** being Christian practice (see below, **εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν**), **ἀσέβεια** is heathen practice, the non-moral life.

τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας: *saecularia desideria* (Vulg.), "the desires of the flesh and of the mind" (Eph. ii. 3), "the lusts of men" (1 Pet. iv. 2); opposed to **σωφρ. καὶ δικαίως**; such as have relation to no higher sphere than that of the visible world. They are analysed in 1 John ii. 16.

σωφρόνως: The reference of the three adverbs is well explained by St. Bernard: "*sobrie* erga nos; *juste* erga proximos; *pie* erga Deum".

Ver. 13. **προσδεχόμενοι κ.τ.λ.**, as already stated, describes the glad expectancy which is the ruling and prevailing thought in the lives of men looking for their Lord's return (Luke xii. 36), **προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Jude 21). *Cf.* Rom. viii. 19; 1 Cor. i. 7; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Thess. i. 10; Heb. ix. 28; 2 Pet. iii. 12. Isa. xxv. 9 is the basal passage. *Cf.* Acts xxiv. 15, **ἐλπίδα ἔχων εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προσδέχονται.** In this quotation **ἐλπίδα** is the mental act, while the relative **ἥν** is the realisation of the hope. **ἐλπίς** is also passive—the thing hoped for—in Gal. v. 5; Col. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 1.

ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης: The Second Coming of Christ will be, as we are assured by Himself, "in the glory of His Father" (Matt. xvi. 27; Mark viii. 38). "We rejoice in the hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v. 2, a passage which supports the view that **δόξης** here is dependent on **ἐλπίδα** as well as on **ἐπιφάνειαν**). von Soden takes **ἐπιφάνειαν** as epexegetical of **ἐλπίδα.** The Second Coming of Christ may, therefore, be regarded as an **ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης Θεοῦ**, even though we should not speak of an **ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ Πατρός**, while **ἐπιφάνεια Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** is normal and natural (see on 1 Tim. vi. 14). **τῆς δόξης** having then an intelligible meaning, we are not entitled to treat it as merely adjectival, *the glorious appearing* (A.V.). The genitival relation does not differ in this case from **τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ** in 2 Thess. ii. 8. See also note on 1 Tim. i. 11. Again, there does not seem any reason why **τοῦ σωτῆρος, κ.τ.λ.**, here should not depend on **ἐπιφάνειαν**, on the analogy of 2 Tim. i. 10. This may be thought too remote. In any case, the conception of the Second Coming as an occasion of manifestation of two **δόξαι**, that of the Father and of the Son, is familiar from Luke ix. 26, **ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, κ.τ.λ.** On the whole, then, we decide in favour of the R.V.m. in the rendering of this passage, *appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.* The grammatical argument—"the identity of reference of two substantives when under the vinculum of a common article"—is too slender to bear much weight, especially when we take into consideration not only the general neglect of the article in these epistles but the omission of it before **σωτήρ** in 1 Tim. i. 1, iv. 10. Ellicott says that "**μεγάλου** would seem uncalled for if applied to the Father". To this it may be answered that (*a*) the epithet is not otiose here; as marking the majesty of God the Father it is parallel to the **ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν, κ.τ.λ.**, which recalls the self-sacrificing love of the Son; both constituting the double appeal—to fear and to love—of the Judgment to come. (*b*) Again, St. Paul is nowhere more emphatic in his lofty language about God the Father than in these epistles; see 1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 15, 16.

This is the only place in the N.T. in

i See 1 Tim. ii. 6.
k Luke xxiv. 21, 1 Pet. i. 18.

[h] ἡμῶν [h] Χριστοῦ [h] Ἰησοῦ,[1] 14. ὃς [i] ἔδωκεν [i] ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα [k] λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας, καὶ [l] καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν

l Acts xv. 9, 2 Cor. vii. 1, Eph. v. 26, Heb. ix. 14, Jas. iv. 8, 1 John i. 7, 9.

[1] So א*FgrG, g, boh.; Ἰησ. Χριστ. א[c]ACDKLP, all cursives, d, e, f, vg., syrr., arm.

which **μέγας** is applied to the true God, although it is a constant predicate of heathen gods and goddesses, *e.g.*, Acts xix. 28. (See Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 563). In view of the fact that the most probable exegesis of Rom. ix. 5 is that **ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς, κ.τ.λ.** refers to Christ, it cannot be said that **ὁ μέγας Θεός,** as applied to Him, is un-Pauline. But the proofs that St. Paul held Christ to be God Incarnate do not lie in a few disputable texts, but in the whole attitude of his soul towards Christ, and in the doctrine of the relation of Christ to mankind which is set forth in his epistles. St. Paul's "declarations of the divinity of the Eternal Son" are not *studied*, as Ellicott admits that this would be if the R.V. rendering (*our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ*) be adopted. To this it may be added that the Versions, with the exception of the Aethiopic, agree with R.V.m. Ell. cites on the other side, of ante-Nicene writers, Clem. Alex., *Protrept.* §7, and Hippolytus, —quoted by Wordsworth—besides the great bulk of the post-Nicene fathers. The text is one which would strike the eye of a reader to whose consciousness the Arian controversy was present; but it is safe to say that if it had read **τοῦ σωτῆρος,** the **μεγάλου** would have excited no comment. Consequently the papyri (all vii. A.D.) cited by J. H. Moulton (*Grammar*, vol. i. p. 84) "which attest the translation *our great God and Saviour* as current among Greek-speaking Christians" are too late as guides to St. Paul's meaning here. The similar problem in 2 Peter i. 1 must be discussed independently. At least, even if it be granted that the R.V. there is correct, and that 2 Peter i. 1 is an example of the transference to Christ of the language used of deified kings "in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times," it does not follow that the same account must be given of Tit. ii. 13.

Ver. 14. **ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν κ.τ.λ.**: see note on 1 Tim. ii. 6. As already observed, this is an appeal from the constraining love of Christ to the responding love of man.

λυτρώσηται: *deliver*. The language is borrowed from Psalm cxxix. (cxxx). 8 **αὐτὸς λυτρώσεται τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτοῦ.** The material supplied by this passage for a discussion of the Atonement is contained in **ἔδωκεν . . . ἡμῶν,** not in **λυτρώσηται.** See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on Eph. i. 14.

ἀνομίας: *Lawlessness* is the essence of sin (1 John iii. 4), self-assertion as opposed to self-sacrifice which is love. Love, which is self-sacrifice, is a dissolvent of self-assertion or sin. And to what degree soever we allow the love of Christ to operate as a controlling principle in our lives, to that degree we are delivered from **ἀνομία,** as an opposing controlling principle.

καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαόν: This is a pregnant expression for "purify and so make them fit to be his people". St. Paul has in mind Ezek. xxxvii. 23, "I will save them out of all their dwelling places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God", **ῥύσομαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν ὧν ἡμάρτοσαν ἐν αὐταῖς, καὶ καθαριῶ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔσονταί μοι εἰς λαόν, κ.τ.λ.** There is in **καθαρίσῃ** an allusion to Holy Baptism, which is explicit in iii. 5. *Cf.* Eph. v. 26, **ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι.**

λαὸν περιούσιον: *populum acceptabilem* (Vulg.). *A people for his own possession* (R.V.) is the modern equivalent of *a peculiar people* (A.V.). **λαὸς περιούσιος** is the LXX for עַם סְגֻלָּה. סְגֻלָּה means "a valued property, a peculiar treasure" (*peculium*), and occurs first in Exodus xix. 5, "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me." Here the LXX inserts **λαός,** possibly from the references in Deut., in which the combination סגלה עם is found. סגלה alone occurs in Malachi iii. 17 (**εἰς περιποίησιν**) and in Ps. cxxxv. 4 (**εἰς περιουσιασμόν**). The LXX of Mal. iii. 17 is echoed in Eph. i. 14, **εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως,** (where see Dean Armitage Robinson's note) and 1 Pet. ii. 9, **λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν,** in which **λαός** is a reminiscence of the

[m] περιούσιον, [n] ζηλωτὴν [o] καλῶν [o] ἔργων. 15. ταῦτα λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἔλεγχε μετὰ πάσης [p] ἐπιταγῆς· μηδείς σου [q] περιφρονείτω.

III. 1. [a] Ὑπομίμνησκε αὐτοὺς [b] ἀρχαῖς [1] [b c] ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι, [d] πειθαρχεῖν, [e f] πρὸς [e] πᾶν [e g] ἔργον [e g] ἀγαθὸν [f] ἑτοίμους εἶναι, 2. μηδένα βλασφημεῖν, [h] ἀμάχους εἶναι, [h] ἐπιεικεῖς, πᾶσαν [i] ἐνδεικνυμένους [k] πραΰτητα πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους. 3. [l] Ἦμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς [l] ἀνόητοι, [m] ἀπειθεῖς, [n] πλανώμενοι, [o] δουλεύοντες [p] ἐπιθυ-

m Exod. xix. 5, xxiii. 22, Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18. n Acts xxi. 20, xxii. 3, 1 Cor. xiv. 12, Gal. i. 14, 1 Pet. iii. 13. o See 1 Tim iii. 1. p 1 Cor. vii. 6, 2 Cor. viii. 8.

q 4 Macc. vi. 9, xiv. 1 only. a See 2 Tim. ii. 14. b Luke xii. 11, xx. 20. c Luke xxiii. 7, Rom. xiii. 1, 2, 3. d Acts v. 29, 32, xxvii. 21. e See 2 Tim. ii. 21. f 1 Pet. iii. 15. g See 1 Tim. ii. 10. h See 1 Tim. iii. 3. i See 2 Tim. iv. 14. k See 2 Tim. ii. 25. l See 1 Tim. vi. 9. m 2 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 16, etc. n See 2 Tim. iii. 13. o Rom. vi. 6. p 2 Tim. iii. 6.

[1] Ins. καὶ DcKLP, d, e, f, m94, vg., syrr., boh., arm.

LXX of the passages in Exod. and Deut. Perhaps **περιούσιος** refers to the treasure as laid up, while **περιποίησις** refers to it as acquired.

ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων: See Eph. ii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 15; Heb. x. 24.

Ver. 15. See on 1 Tim. iv. 12.

ταῦτα is best connected with **λάλει** only, and referred to the positive instructions of chap. ii., "the things which befit the sound doctrine"; while **παρακάλει** and **ἔλεγχε** represent the two main functions of the pastor. See i. 9.

ἐπιταγῆς: *authority, imperio;* **πάσης ἐπιτ·**: *in the most authoritative manner possible*; not to be connected with **ἔλεγχε** only.

μηδείς σου περιφρονείτω: another way of saying **μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς**. *Do not permit thine authority to be despised, Be consistent.* See 1 Tim. iv. 12.

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-2. As your Cretan folk are naturally intractable, be careful to insist on obedience to the constituted authorities, and on the maintenance of friendly relations with non-Christians.

Ver. 1. With these instructions as to duty towards civil authority, compare Rom. xiii. 1 *sqq.*, 1 Pet. ii. 13 *sqq.* It is perhaps significant of the difference between Crete and the province of Asia, as regards respect for law, that in 1 Tim. ii. 1-3, reasons are given why we should pray for rulers, while here the more elementary duty of obedience is enjoined. Polybius (vi. 46. 9) remarks on the seditious character of the Cretans.

ὑπομίμνησκε: See note on 2 Tim. ii. 14.

ἀρχαῖς: **ἀρχαί** and **ἐξουσίαι** are coupled in this sense in Luke xii. 11; **ἀρχή** and **ἐξουσία** in the abstract, Luke xx. 20. The two words are coupled together as names for ranks of angels in Eph. iii. 10, vi. 12, Col. i. 16, ii. 10, 15; with **δύναμις**, 1 Cor. xv. 24, Eph. i. 21; **ἀρχαί**, alone, Rom. viii. 38.

πειθαρχεῖν: (*dicto obedire*) is best taken absolutely, and with a wider reference than the preceding clause: *i.e.*, as R.V., *to be obedient*, rather than merely *to obey magistrates* (A.V.).

πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν. See reff.

Ver. 2. **ἀμάχους . . . ἐπιεικεῖς**: coupled as qualifications of the episcopus, 1 Tim. iii. 3.

πᾶσαν πραΰτητα: *the greatest possible meekness.* Compare Eph. iv. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 15.

Vv. 3-7. Cretans who hear this epistle need not feel hurt as though I were thinking of them with exceptional severity. We were such ourselves until we came to know the love of God, unmerited and saving and sanctifying and perfecting.

Ver. 3. **ἦμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς**: The connexion is: you need not suppose that it is hopeless to imagine that these wild Cretan folk can be reclaimed. We ourselves are a living proof of the power of God's grace. Eph. ii. 3 *sqq.* is an exact parallel. *Cf.* also 1 Cor. vi. 11, Eph. v. 8, Col. iii. 7, 1 Pet. iv. 3.

ἀνόητοι: *insipientes, foolish*, in the sense in which the word is used in Proverbs (*e.g.* xvii. 28), *without understanding of spiritual things.*

πλανώμενοι: The analogy of 2 Tim. iii. 13 suggests that this is passive, *deceived*, not neuter, *errantes* (Vulg.), though of course there are many ex-

q Luke viii. 14, Jas. iv. 1, 3, 2 Pet. ii. 13. r Rom. i. 29, 1 Pet. ii. 1. s See 1 Tim. ii. 2. t Here only, not LXX. u Matt. xxiv. 10. v Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22 *ter.*, Eph. ii. 7 (Paul elsewhere 4 times). w Acts xxviii. 2 only, N.T., Esth. (1). 2 Macc. (2), 3 Macc. (2). x See Tit. ii. 11. y See 1 Tim. i. 1. z 1 Pet. i. 3. a Eph. v. 26 only, N.T., Cant. iv. 2, vi. 5, Ecclus. xxxi. (xxxiv.) 25. b Matt. xix. 28 only, not LXX. c Rom. xii. 2 only, not LXX, *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 16, Col. iii. 10.

q μίαις καὶ q ἡδοναῖς p ποικίλαις, ἐν r κακίᾳ καὶ r φθόνῳ s διάγοντες, t στυγητοί, u μισοῦντες u ἀλλήλους. 4. ὅτε δὲ ἡ v χρηστότης καὶ ἡ w φιλανθρωπία x ἐπεφάνη τοῦ y σωτῆρος y ἡμῶν y Θεοῦ, 5. οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων

[1] ὧν CbDcKLP. [2] τὸν . . . ἔλεον DbcKL. [3] Ins. τοῦ A.

amples of this latter sense in the N.T.

ποικίλαις: See note on 2 Tim. iii. 6.

διάγοντες: *sc* **βίον**, as in 1 Tim. ii. 2.

στυγητοί κ.τ.λ.: *odibiles, odientes invicem* (Vulg.). This marks the stage of degradation, before it becomes hopeless: when vice becomes odious to the vicious, stands a self-confessed failure to produce happiness.

Ver. 4. **χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία**: (*benignitas . . . humanitas*) is a constant combination in Greek. See many examples supplied by Field. Here it expresses the notion of John iii. 16, **οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον κ.τ.λ.** and of Eph. ii. 4-6. Perhaps also, as von Soden suggests, the kindness of God is here contrasted with the unkindness of men to each other; *cf.* Eph. iv. 31, 32.

χρηστότης is a Pauline word, used of God also in reff. **φιλανθρωπία** is especially used of the beneficent feelings of divine beings towards men; more rarely of the relations between man and man, as in Acts xxviii. 2. Diogenes Laert., quoted by Alf., distinguishes three kinds of **φιλανθρ.** (1) geniality of manner, (2) helpfulness, (3) sociability.

ἐπεφάνη: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 14.

τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ: **θεοῦ**, as in i. 3, ii. 10, is epexegetical of **σωτῆρος**.

Ver. 5. The **ἡμεῖς** and **ἡμᾶς** refer to the same persons as those mentioned in verse 3, *i.e.*, the apostles and those who have had a similar experience. The verse may be paraphrased as a statement of fact thus:—God saved us by Baptism, which involves two complementary processes, (*a*) the ceremony itself which marks the actual moment in time of the new birth, and (*b*) the daily, hourly, momently renewing of the Holy Spirit, by which the spiritual life is supported and fostered and increased. And the moving cause of this exceeding kindness of God was not any merits of our own, but His mercy

οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων: **ἐκ** here, as in Rom iii. 30, expresses the source. See also the emphatic repetition in Gal. ii. 16 of **οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.** The **δικαιοσύνη** here is that which we can call our own, **ἡ ἐκ νόμου** (Phil. iii. 9). Its existence as **δικαιοσύνη** must not be denied; but it does not pass as current coin in the kingdom of God. It has indeed no saving value whatever. Accordingly there is no question here as to whether we did, or did not do, works which are **ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.** "Not the labours of my hands can fulfil *Thy* law's demands." See note on 2 Tim. i. 9.

Bengel, comparing Deut. ix. 5, refers the negative to each term in the clause: we had not been **ἐν δικ.**; we had not done **ἔργα ἐν δικ.**; we had no works through which we could be saved. But this exegesis is too much affected by the controversies of the sixteenth century. The A.V., *which we have done*, confuses the thought by a suggestion that the works referred to are those "after justification".

τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ: **δικαιοσύνη** is the sphere in which the works were done, and to which they are related.

κατὰ . . . ἔλεος: The phraseology is borrowed from Ps. cviii. (cix.) 26, **σῶσόν με κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου.** A remarkable parallel is furnished by 1 Pet. i. 3, **ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς**; and also by 2 Esdr. viii. 32, "For if thou hast a desire to have mercy upon us, then shalt thou be called merciful, to us, namely, that have no works of righteousness".

ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς: The N.T. seldom diverts attention from the main lesson to be taught from time to time by noting qualifications, even necessary ones. Here St. Paul is speaking only about the efficient and instrumental and formal causes of salvation, without any thought of man's part in co-operation with God. It is as when teaching the principles of

νώσεως [1] Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, 6. οὗ [d] ἐξέχεεν ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς [e] πλουσίως διὰ [f] Ἰησοῦ [f] Χριστοῦ [f] τοῦ [f] σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, 7. ἵνα [g] δικαιωθέντες [g] τῇ [g] ἐκείνου [g] χάριτι [h] κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν [2] κατ᾽ [i] ἐλπίδα [i k] ζωῆς [i k] αἰωνίου. 8. [i] Πιστὸς [i] ὁ [i] λόγος· καὶ περὶ τούτων [m] βούλομαί σε

d Acts ii. 17, 18, 33 (= Joel iii. 1). e See 1 Tim. vi. 17. f See 2 Tim. i. 10. g Rom. iii. 24. h Rom. iv. 14, viii. 17, Gal. iii. 29, iv. 7, Heb. vi. 17, Jas. ii. 5. i Tit. i. 2. k See 1 Tim. i. 16. l See 1 Tim. i. 15. m See 1 Tim. ii. 8.

[1] Ins. διὰ D*FG, d, e, g. [2] γενώμεθα ℵcDcKL.

mechanics, we do not confuse the beginner's mind by making allowances for friction, etc. Here, as in Rom. vi. and 1 Pet. iii. 21, it is assumed that man co-operates with God in the work of his own salvation. On the force of the aorist, **ἔσωσεν**, see note on 1 Tim. ii. 4.

διὰ λουτροῦ: *the washing*. **λουτρόν** may mean the *water used for washing*, or *the process itself of washing*. The R.V.m. *laver* would be **λουτήρ**. See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on Eph. v. 26.

παλινγενεσίας: This defines the nature of the **λουτρόν** which God employs as His instrument in effecting the salvation of man; not any **λουτρόν** whatever, but that of new birth. It is sufficient to observe here that much of the controversy about regeneration might have been avoided had men kept before them the analogy of natural birth, followed as it is immediately, not by vigorous manhood, but by infancy and childhood and youth.

ἀνακαινώσεως: The genitive **ἀνακαινώσεως** depends on **διὰ** (which is actually inserted in the Harclean Syriac; so R.V.m., *and through renewing*), not on **λουτροῦ**, as apparently Vulg., *per lavacrum regenerationis et renovationis Spiritus Sancti*, f. Boh. Arm., followed by R.V. The **λουτρόν**, *the washing*, secures a claim on the Holy Spirit for *renewing*, just as birth gives a child a claim on society for food and shelter; but unless we are compelled to do otherwise, it is best to keep the two notions distinct. Birth, natural or spiritual, must be a definite fact taking place at a particular moment; whereas renewing is necessarily a subsequent process, constantly operating. Without this renewing the life received at birth is at best in a state of suspension. The references to **ἀνακαίνωσις** and **ἀνακαινοῦν**, and the similar passage, Eph. iv. 23, show that the terms are always used of those who are actually living the Christian life.

Ver. 6. **οὗ ἐξέχεεν**: Joel iii. 1 (ii. 28) is the passage alluded to. *Cf.* in addition to reff. given above, Acts x. 45, Rom. v. 5, Gal. iv. 6. The **οὗ** refers of course to **πνεύματ. ἁγ.** by attraction, not to **ἀνακαινώσεως**. All gifts of the Holy Spirit that come through Jesus Christ are a continuation of the Pentecostal outpouring. The aorist is due to the Apostle's thought of that occasion, although the **ἡμᾶς** shows that the immediate reference is to the experience of St. Paul and other Christians.

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: to be connected with **ἐξέχεεν**. See John xv. 26, Acts ii. 33. The finished work of Jesus Christ was the necessary pre-condition to His effusion of the Holy Spirit.

Ver. 7. **ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.**: It is not quite certain, whether this expresses the object of **ἐξέχεεν** or of **ἔσωσεν**. The former connexion brings out best the climax of the passage. **κληρονόμοι** marks the highest point to which man can attain in this life. See reff. The two preceding stages are marked by **λουτρὸν παλινγενεσίας** and **ἀνακαίνωσις**, while **δικαιωθέντες . . . χάριτι** is an expression in theological language of the simpler **κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς**. The grace by which man is justified is usually spoken of as that of God the Father, Rom. iii. 24; and so **ἐκείνου**, not **αὐτοῦ**, is used as referring to the remoter antecedent.

κληρονόμοι: According to the analogy of the other passages where it occurs, this word is best taken absolutely; or, if the notion must be completed, we may understand **θεοῦ**. The term would not need any elucidation to one of St. Paul's company. It is also an argument against connecting **κληρ. ζωῆς αἰωνίου** (R.V.m) that **ἔλπις ζωῆς αἰωνίου** occurs in i. 2; and Gal. iii. 29, **κατ᾽ ἐπαγγελίαν κληρ.**, is parallel.

Vv. 8-11. To sum up what I have been saying: Belief in God is not a matter of theory or of speculation, but of practice; it must be accompanied by good works. This true religion unites the beautiful and the profitable. On the other hand, foolish speculations and controversies about the law are profitless

n 1 Tim. i. 7, not LXX. o Here only, not LXX. p Tit. iii. 14, see 1 Tim. iii. 1. q Acts xv. 5, xviii. 27, xix. 18, xxi. 20, 25. r Gen. xv. 6 (Rom. iv. 3, Gal. iii. 6, Jas. ii. 23), 1 John v. 10. s *Cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 3. t See 1 Tim. iv. 8. u 2 Tim. ii. 23. v See 1 Tim. vi. 4. w See 1 Tim. i. 4. x See 2 Tim. ii. 23. y Here only in this sense (see ver. 13), not LXX. z See 2 Tim. ii. 16. a Heb. vii. 18, Prov xxviii. 3, Wisd. i. 11, Isa. xliv. 10, Jer. ii. 8 only. b Here only, not LXX. c 1 Cor. x. 11, Eph. vi. 4, Wisd. xvi. 6 only.

[1] Ins. **τῷ** most cursives. [2] Ins. **τὰ** DᶜKLP.

[3] So ℵᶜACKLP, d, e, f, g, m5ᵒ, vg, boh, syrr, arm; **ἔριν** ℵ* [DᵍʳFᵍʳGᵍʳ, **ερειν**], Jerome once.

[4] **μίαν νουθ. καὶ[ἢ] δευτ.** DᶜFᵍʳG [D*, d, e, **καὶ δύο**], g; om. **καὶ δευτέραν** MSS. known to Jerome, m5ᵒ, Iren. lat., Pamph. lat., Ruf., Tert., Cyp., Lucif., Aug., Amb., Ambrst.

and unpractical. Do not parley long with a confirmed schismatic. If he does not yield to one or two admonitions, reject him altogether. It is beyond your power to set him right.

Ver. 8. **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος.** Here it is evident that **ὁ λόγος** does not refer to any isolated Saying, but to the doctrinal statement contained in verses 4-7 regarded as a single concept—as we, when we speak of *The Incarnation*, sum up in one term a whole system of theology—while **τούτων** refers to the various topics indicated in that statement, not to the practical teaching of ii. 1—iii. 7.

βούλομαι: see note on 1 Tim. ii. 8.

διαβεβαιοῦσθαι: Here the Vulg. has *confirmare*; d has *affirmare*, as in 1 Tim. i. 7, where see note.

ἵνα: It is most significant and suggestive that the apostle held that good works were most certainly assured by a theology which gives special prominence to the free unmerited grace of God. This is made plainer in the R.V. (*to the end that*), than in the A.V. (*that*).

φροντίζωσιν: *curent* (am.), *curam habeant* (fuld).

καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι: *occupy themselves in good works*, *bonis operibus praeesse* (Vulg.). *Prostare* would have been a better translation, since the **πρό** in this use of **προΐστασθαι** is derived from bodily posture rather than from superiority in station. "From the practice of the workman or tradesman *standing before* his shop for the purpose of soliciting customers . . . we arrive at the general meaning of *conducting* or *managing any matter of business*." So Field, who also points out that the R.V. m., *profess honest occupations* (similarly A.V.m on ver. 14) is open to the serious objection that **καλὰ ἔργα** everywhere else in N.T., as well as in secular authors, means "good works" in the religious or moral sense.

οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ: This simple phrase is used designedly in order to express the notion that profession of the recently revealed Gospel is indeed merely a logical consequence and natural development of the older simple belief in God.

ταῦτα: The antithesis in the following **μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις** proves that *these things* refers to the subject-matter of Titus' pronouncements (**διαβεβαιοῦσθαι**), and means *this enforcement of practical religion*.

καλά: is to be taken absolutely, as in the parallel 1 Tim. ii. 3, and is not to be connected with **τοῖς ἀνθρώποις**.

Ver. 9. **ζητήσεις** and **γενεαλογίαι** are associated together in 1 Tim. i. 4 (where see notes). Here they are co-ordinated; there the **γενεαλογίαι** are one of the sources whence **ζητήσεις** originate. The nature of the **ἔρεις** here deprecated is determined by the context. **ἔρεις** indicate the spirit of contentiousness; **μάχαι** the conflicts as heard and seen. On **μάχαι**, see 2 Tim. ii. 23. The **μάχαι νομικαί** are no doubt the same as the **λογομαχίαι** of 1 Tim. vi. 4. Speaking broadly, the controversy turned on the attempt to give a fictitious permanence to the essentially transient elements in the Mosaical Law.

περίστασο: See note on 2 Tim. ii. 16.

μάταιοι: Here, and in James i. 26, **μάταιος** is an adjective of two terminations; yet **ματαία** occurs 1 Cor. xv. 17; **ματαίας**, 1 Peter i. 18.

Ver. 10. **αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον**: St.

[d] παραιτοῦ, 11. εἰδὼς ὅτι [e] ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ ἁμαρτάνει, ὢν [f] αὐτοκατάκριτος.

12. [g] Ὅταν πέμψω [h] Ἀρτεμᾶν πρός σε ἢ Τυχικόν, [i] σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρός με εἰς Νικόπολιν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ [j] κέκρικα [k] παραχειμάσαι. 13.

d See 1 Tim. iv. 7.
e Deut. xxxii. 20, etc., here only, N.T
f Here only, not LXX.
g See 2 Tim. i. 15.
h Acts iii. 13, xx. 16, xxv. 25, xxvii. 1, 1 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 37, 2 Cor. ii. 1. 12, xxviii. 11, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, not LXX.
i Acts xxvii.

Paul passes from the reprehensible opinions to the man who propagates them. He is the same kind of man as the **φιλόνεικος** of 1 Cor. xi. 16; or "he that refuseth to hear the church" of Matt. xviii. 17; he is of "them which cause divisions and occasions of stumbling," Rom. xvi. 17. The term **αἵρεσις** is applied in a non-offensive sense to the sects of Judaism, Acts v. 17, xv. 5, xxvi. 5. St. Luke represents the Jews as so speaking of the Christian Church (Acts xxiv. 5, xxviii. 22), and St. Paul as resenting this application of the term (Acts xxiv. 14). The Apostle himself uses the word in an unfavourable sense (1 Cor. xi. 19; Gal. v. 20), as does 2 Pet. ii. 1. A comparison of 1 Cor. xi. 19 with 1 John ii. 19 suggests that **αἵρεσις** involved the formation of a separate society (so R.V.m. here, *factious*), not merely the holding of aberrant opinions, or the favouring a policy different from that of the Church rulers. The **νουθεσία** addressed to a member of such a **αἵρεσις** would be of the nature of a verbal remonstrance, pointing out the essentially unchristian character of needless separation. It is evident that the **αἱρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος** would be beyond any Church discipline. The permission of a second attempt at reconciliation is probably not unconnected with our Lord's counsel, Matt. xviii. 15.

παραιτοῦ: *Have nothing to do with him.* See note on 1 Tim. iv. 7. The word does not necessarily imply any formal excommunication. Such procedure would be unnecessary. Excommunication has no terrors for those who deliberately separate themselves. "Monere desine. quid enim iuvat? laterem lavares" (Bengel).

Ver. 11. **εἰδώς**: *since thou mayest know.*

ἐξέστραπται: *subversus est.* Argument with a man whose basal mental convictions differ from your own, or whose mind has had a twist, is mere waste of breath.

αὐτοκατάκριτος: *proprio iudicio condemnatus* (Vulg.). He is self-condemned because his separation from the Church is due to his own acknowledged act. He cannot deny that his views are antagonistic to those which he once accepted as true; he is condemned by his former, and, as St. Paul would say, his more enlightened self.

Vv. 12-14. Come to me, as soon as you can be spared. Forward *Z*enas and Apollos. Let our friends in Crete remember that fruitfulness in good works is the one thing needful for them.

Ver. 12. **ὅταν πέμψω πρός σε**: It is natural to suppose that Artemas or Tychicus would take the place of Titus as apostolic legate in Crete. This temporary exercise of apostolic superintendence marks a stage in the development of monarchical local episcopacy in the later sense.

Ἀρτεμᾶν: The name is "Greek, formed from Ἄρτεμις perhaps by contraction from Artemidorus, a name common in Asia Minor" (W. Lock, art. in Hastings' *D. B.*).

Τυχικόν: See note on 2 Tim. iv. 12.

Νικόπολιν: The subscription in the later MSS. at the end of the epistle, **ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς Μακεδονίας**, follows the Greek commentators (Chrys., Theod., etc.), in identifying this Nicopolis with that in Thrace, on the Nestus; but makes a stupid mistake in not perceiving that **ἐκεῖ** proves that St. Paul was not at Nicopolis when the letter was written. If we suppose that the situation of St. Paul, when writing 2 Tim., must have been somewhere between Dalmatia, Thessalonica, Corinth, Miletus, Ephesus and Troas, then Nicopolis *ad Nestum* would meet the needs of the case. But the more important Nicopolis in Epirus has found more favour with modern scholars (see art. by W. M. Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.*).

παραχειμάσαι: It is possible that the winter is that mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 21. The apostle was not always permitted to exercise the gift of prophecy, in the sense of being able to foretell future events. From this point of view, *There I have determined to winter* may be compared with the earlier *I know that ye all . . . shall see my face no more* (Acts xx. 25).

Ver. 13. **νομικόν**: In the absence of

k Matt. xxii. 35, Luke (7), *cf.* ver. 9. 1 See 2 Tim. i. 17. m Acts xv. 3, xx. 38, xxi. 5, Rom. xv. 24, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11, 2 Cor. i. 16, 3 John 6. n See Tit. i. 5. o Here only. p Ver. 8. q See 1 Tim. iii. 1. r Acts x. 24, 1 Cor. xii. 22. s Acts vi. 3, xx. 34, xxviii. 10, Rom. xii. 13, Eph. iv. 29, Phil. ii. 25, iv. 16, 19. t 2 Pet. i. 8, Matt. xiii. 22 (= Mark iv. 19), 1 Cor. xiv. 14, Eph. v. 11, Jude 12. u Matt. (5), Mark (1), Luke (2), John (13), 1 Cor. xvi. 22, Rev. (2). v See 1 Tim. i. 2.

Ζηνᾶν τὸν [k] νομικὸν καὶ Ἀπολλὼν[1] [l] σπουδαίως [m] πρόπεμψον, ἵνα μηδὲν αὐτοῖς [n] λείπῃ.[2] 14. μανθανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ [o] οἱ [o] ἡμέτεροι [p q] καλῶν [p q] ἔργων [p] προΐστασθαι εἰς τὰς [r] ἀναγκαίας [s] χρείας, ἵνα μὴ ὦσιν [t] ἄκαρποι. 15. Ἀσπάζονταί σε οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες· ἄσπασαι τοὺς [u] φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς [v] ἐν [v] πίστει. Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.[3]

[1] So ℵ*DbH* one cursive; Ἀπολλωνα FG; g (*apollo t apollonem*); Ἀπολλώ CD*cH**KLP, d, e, f, vg.

[2] λίπῃ ℵD*, 37, 47*, about thirteen others.

[3] Ins. ἀμήν ℵcDbcFGHKLP, e, f, g, vg. (not fuld.), syrr.

Add πρὸς Τίτον ℵC, 17, to which D adds ἐπληρώθη; AP add ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως; FG have ἐτελέσθη ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Τίτον; K has πρὸς Τίτον τῆς Κρητῶν ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα, ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς Μακεδονίας. Similarly HL.

any example of this word being used as the equivalent of *legisperitus* (Vulg.), *jurisconsultus* or *jurisperitus*, it seems best to assume that Zenas was a **νομικός** in the usual N.T. sense, an expert in the Mosaic Law.

Ἀπολλὼν: For Apollos, see article in Hastings' *D. B.*

πρόπεμψον: *set forward on their journey*, *praemitte*; but *deduco* is the rendering where the word occurs elsewhere. See reff.

Ver. 14. The **δέ** does not mark an antithesis between **οἱ ἡμέτεροι** and the persons who have just been mentioned, but is rather resumptive of verse 8; repeating and emphasising at the close of the letter that which St. Paul had most at heart, the changed lives of the Cretan converts. **οἱ ἡμέτεροι** of course means *those of our faith* in Crete.

καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι: See on verse 8.

εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας: The best commentary on this expression is 1 Thess. iv. 9-12. Although **καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι** does not mean *to profess honest occupations*, yet it is plain from St. Paul's letters that he would regard the earning one's own bread respectably as a condition precedent to the doing of good works. The *necessary wants* to which allusion is made are the maintenance of oneself and family, and helping brethren who are unable to help themselves (Acts xx. 35; Rom. xii. 13; Eph. iv. 28). This view is borne out by the reason which follows, **ἵνα μὴ ὦσιν ἄκαρποι.** See John xv. 2, Phil. iv. 17, Col. i. 10, 2 Pet. i. 8.

Ver. 15. Final Salutation.

οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ: The preposition is different elsewhere in Paul: **οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί**, Gal. i. 2; **οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί**, Phil. iv. 21. **οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ** is a constant phrase in the Synoptists. There is a similar use of **μετά** in Acts xx. 34 (a speech of St. Paul's), and in 2 Tim. iv. 11.

τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει; *The faith* (see note on 1 Tim. i. 2) is that which binds Christians together more or less closely. Timothy and Titus were St. Paul's **τέκνα ἐν πίστει**; others were more distantly related to him, though of the same family, "the household of faith".

Dean Armitage Robinson (*Ephesians*, p. 281) gives several examples from papyri of similar formulas of closing, especially two, which read, **ἀσπάζου . . . τοὺς φιλοῦντες σε** (or **ἡμᾶς**) **πρὸς ἀληθίαν.** This suggests the rendering here, *those who love us truly*.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO

PHILEMON

INTRODUCTION.

§ I. *Authorship, Place and Date.*—The external evidence for the authenticity of this Epistle is sufficiently strong; it is included among the Pauline writings in the collection of Marcion; Tertullian mentions this in his *Adv. Marc.* v. 42. It is also mentioned, in connexion with the Pastoral Epistles, in the Muratorian Fragment. Origen ascribes it to St. Paul (*Hom. in Matth.* xxxiii., xxxiv.); Eusebius reckons it among the ὁμολογούμενα (*H. E.* iii. 25); Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle, mentions the fact that its genuineness was disputed by some because it did not treat of doctrinal matters; he holds that it would not have been received by the Church from the beginning unless it had been St. Paul's. The fact that it is not mentioned in the sub-apostolic literature cannot excite suspicion, for its shortness and the character of its contents sufficiently account for this non-mention. The internal evidence is equally strong; the Epistle bears the impress of the Pauline spirit throughout; and one has only to compare the vocabulary and style with those of the other Pauline Epistles to be convinced at once that St. Paul wrote it. Very few among modern scholars reject its Pauline authorship; van Manen, for example, finds a difficulty in the "surprising mixture of singular and plural both in the persons speaking and in the persons addressed. This double form points at once to some peculiarity in the composition of the Epistle. It is not a style that is natural to any one who is writing freely and untrammelled, whether to one person or many" (*Encycl. Bibl.* col. 3695). Such a futile objection is self-condemnatory; but he continues: "Here, as throughout the discussion, the constantly recurring questions as to the reason for the selection of the forms, words, expressions adopted, find their answer in the observation that the Epistle was written under the influence of a perusal of 'Pauline' epistles, especially of those to the Ephesians and Colossians" (*ibid.*). That is as much as to say that the fact that a writer is writing in his usual style is presumptive evidence that his style is being imitated by someone else! The minute verbal comparisons which van Manen tabulates between this and the other

Pauline (he would write 'Pauline') Epistles constitutes a strong proof of identity of authorship between them. Objectors like the writer mentioned are, of course, exceptional; as Jülicher says, "the all but universal judgment is that Philemon belongs to the least doubtful part of the Apostle's work" (*Intr. to the N. T.* p. 127).

The *Place* of writing and the *Date* of the Epistle are mutually determining; St. Paul was in prison when he wrote it, therefore the Epistle must have come either from Cæsarea (Acts xxiv.-xxvi.), or from Rome (Acts xxviii. 30); the time of these two imprisonments was A.D. 58-63; the vast majority of writers are agreed that the group of Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians and to Philemon were written from Rome (see, for the reasons for this view, Lightfoot's *Philippians*, pp. 30 ff.); this would narrow the date of our Epistle down to somewhere between A.D. 60-63. As to the question whether Philemon was written early or late within this period, this depends upon the answer to the question as to whether the Epistle to the Philippians should be placed early in the Roman captivity and the three other Epistles later, or *vice versa*, for it is generally allowed that the Epistle to the Philippians stands alone, the other three were written and despatched at or about the same time. For a full discussion of these questions reference must be made to Lightfoot's *Philippians*, pp. 30-46; here it will have to suffice to say that the most probable year for the date of *Philemon* is A.D. 62.

§ II. *Occasion and Contents.*—Although the Epistle is not the only one of St. Paul's addressed to an individual which has come down to us, it is the only one of a, mainly, *private* character; for although in the opening salutation Apphia, Archippus and the Church in Philemon's house are addressed as well as Philemon himself, nevertheless the contents of the Epistle deal with a personal matter. The nearest parallel in the N.T. is 3 John, addressed to "Gaius the beloved". The Epistle is an appeal made by St. Paul to Philemon on behalf of the runaway slave, Onesimus. Philemon was a citizen of Colossæ (*cf.* Col. iv. 17, Philem. 2, 10-12, and see Col. iv. 9); the Word was most likely preached here during the period which St. Paul spent at Ephesus, from which centre his influence extended widely (see Acts xix. 26, 1 Cor. xvi. 19); Philemon was among the converts made by St. Paul himself (see Philem. 19), and he evidently became a zealous worker, since St. Paul applies the title συνεργός to him; that he was loving and hospitable is clear from vv. 5-7.

Onesimus, the immediate cause of the Epistle, who had run away from his master, also became a convert of St. Paul's (ver. 10); from ver. 18 it would almost seem as though he had committed a theft;

if so, the reason of his having run away would have been fear of punishment. St. Paul's influence upon him must have been strong to have induced him to return. The name Onesimus, like Philemon, is Phrygian; for some reason or other Phrygian slaves were regarded with contempt: Φρὺξ ἀνὴρ πληγεὶς ἄμεινον καὶ διακονέστερος (mentioned by Vincent as being quoted by Wallon, *Hist. de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, ii. 61, 62). The name was very commonly given to slaves, and appears over and over again on inscriptions as the name of a slave or a freedman.

The letter in which St. Paul intercedes for Onesimus was sent by Tychicus, who was going to Colossæ and Laodicæa with other letters from him to the churches there. Nothing could exceed the affectionate tactfulness displayed in the Epistle; the delicate way in which St. Paul combines the appeal to all that is best in Philemon with a gentle, yet distinct assertion of his own authority (see vv. 8, 9, 21) is very striking. The Epistle is a witness to the high demands which Christianity makes upon men; and the way in which it teaches the universal brotherhood of man together with the eternal truth that one man is better than another—or worse—and that therefore class distinctions lie within the nature of things; this is another side of its permanent value. The power of the Gospel and the noble character of St. Paul are the two notes sounded throughout; or, as Lightfoot so well expresses it, the special value of the Epistle lies in the fact that "nowhere is the social influence of the Gospel more strikingly exerted, nowhere does the nobility of the Apostle's character receive a more vivid illustration than in this accidental pleading on behalf of a runaway slave".

§ III. *Slavery, Jewish and Roman.*—The question of slavery so obviously suggests itself in connexion with this Epistle that a short section on the subject seems called for. It is not enough to refer only to Roman slavery, although Onesimus was a slave and Philemon a master under the Roman *régime;* for St. Paul was a Hebrew, and the Hebrew conception of slavery must, therefore, be taken into account as well. "Slavery was practised by the Hebrews under the sanction of the Mosaic law, not less than by the Greeks and Romans. But though the same in name, it was in its actual working"—and, we may add, in its whole theory and conception—"something wholly different" (Lightfoot, *Philemon*, p. 319). The Hebrew laws regarding slavery were exceedingly humane, for Hebrew slaves belonged to the Covenant people, for which reason also they were regarded as members of their owner's family; they therefore had their social, as well as their religious rights. A Hebrew slave could not be kept

as such for more than six years at the outside, unless he himself wished it; the laws concerning the redemption of a slave are very explicit. But owing to the conditions of society in ancient times there can be no doubt that a slave was, as a rule, much better off in a servile condition than if he were free; it was for this reason that the Hebrews had a special law laying down the procedure in the case of those who desired to continue bondmen "for ever". According to Jer. xxxiv. 8-24, however, permanent enslavement of Hebrew men and women is strongly denounced as a sin which will bring about national disaster. According to Lev. xxv. 45, 46, the Hebrew was permitted to buy Gentile slaves, who became personal property and were inherited by the owner's children. But the owner's power over his slaves was strictly limited by the law; if he punished a slave in such a way as to cause permanent bodily injury the slave gained his freedom as compensation; if a master chastised his slave so as to cause his death, he was treated as a murderer. Then, again, according to Hebrew law, a slave who had escaped was not to be delivered up again to his master. St. Paul cannot, of course, be accused of having broken this law in the case of Onesimus, since the latter returned voluntarily; but it is, however, possible that when St. Paul wrote, "For perhaps he was therefore parted from thee for a season, that thou shouldest have him for ever," he had in mind the law of the slave's voluntary return to his master in order to remain his "bondman for ever" (Deut. xv. 16, 17), and thought of how that law had been "fulfilled" by the teaching of Christ (see Matt. v. 17).

Much ancient traditional matter is contained in Talmudical writings; it is, therefore, interesting to note one or two *data* in these on the subject of slaves; it is said, for example, that the master of a Hebrew slave (man or woman) must place him on an equality with himself "in meat and drink, in lodging and bed-clothes, and must act towards him in a brotherly manner," so that a saying is preserved in *Kiddushin*, 20*a* that, "whosoever buys a Hebrew slave buys a master for himself". Again, the law concerning the escaped slave, referred to above, is in the Talmud construed as applying to one who flees from a place outside the Holy Land into it; but the slave must give the master from whom he has fled a bond for his value; if the master refuses to manumit the slave by deed, the court protects the former bondman in his refusal to serve further (*Gittin*, 45*a*). According to Rabbinical teaching a runaway slave who is recaptured must make good the time of his absence; if this is traditional and ancient law, which is very probable, it throws an interesting side-light upon our Epistle; in the first place, it may, in part, have been the reason for St. Paul's

insistence on the return of Onesimus to his master; and in the second place, it may have some bearing on the words in vv. 18, 19, "But if he hath wronged thee at all, or oweth thee aught, put that to mine account; I Paul write it with mine own hand, I will repay it"; these last words are perhaps meant literally, the reference being to manual labour, or the like, which St. Paul was prepared to undertake in order to make up for the time lost by Onesimus, this lost time having presumably occasioned loss to Philemon. For the above see further Exod. xxi. 2-11, Lev. xxv. 39-54, Deut. xv. 12-18, xxiii. 16, 17 (15, 16 R.V.); Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. des Judenthums* i. p. 947; *Jewish Encycl.* xi. 404 ff.

These few *data* are sufficient to show the spirit of mercy and fellow-feeling which characterised Jewish slavery.

Utterly different from this was the Roman system; this is well described in Lighfoot's *Colossians and Philemon*, pp. 320 ff., and with great minuteness in Wallon's *Hist. de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité* (2nd ed.), which is the chief authority on the subject. For details concerning slavery in the Roman empire recourse must be had to these works; and for a description of the appalling moral effects of the institution upon both masters and slaves, see Vincent's *Commentary*, pp. 163 ff. While there were undoubtedly exceptions, cp., *e.g.*, the letter written by the younger Pliny (Ep. ix. 21), quoted by Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 316, the general rule was that the Roman system was, practically, the antithesis of the Jewish.

St. Paul's attitude towards slavery must be understood in the light of the Jewish system; this contained within itself the germs of the Christian conception of man, which was bound sooner or later to prove fatal to slavery. "When the Gospel taught that God had made all men and women upon earth of one family; that all alike were His sons and His daughters; that, whatever conventional distinctions human society might set up, the supreme King of Heaven refused to acknowledge any; that the slave, notwithstanding his slavery, was Christ's freedman, and the free, notwithstanding his liberty, was Christ's slave; when the Church carried out this principle by admitting the slave to her highest privileges, inviting him to kneel side by side with his master at the same holy table; when, in short, the Apostolic precept that 'in Christ Jesus is neither bond nor free' was not only recognised, but acted upon, then slavery was doomed" (Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 325).

§ IV. *Literature*:—

Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, 1884.

Von Soden, "Philemon," in Holtzmann's *Hand Kommentar*, 1891.

Vincent, "Philemon," in the *International Critical Commentary*, 1897.

The articles on Philemon in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible* and Cheyne's *Encycl. Biblica.*

For the abbreviations in the Apparatus Criticus see the Introduction to *St. James.* The Greek text is that published by Nestle, 1907.

ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΗΜΟΝΑ[1]

1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ [a]δέσμιος[2] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ [b]ἀδελφὸς Φιλήμονι τῷ [c]ἀγαπητῷ[3] καὶ [d]συνεργῷ ἡμῶν, 2. καὶ Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ [e]ἀδελφῇ[4] καὶ [f]Ἀρχίππῳ τῷ [g]συστρατιώτῃ ἡμῶν καὶ [h]τῇ κατ᾽

a Acts xxiii. 18, Eph. iii. 1.
b Col. i. 1.
c Acts xv. 25, Rom. xvi. 9.
d Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21, Phil. ii. 25, Col. iv. 11, 3 John 8.
e Rom. xvi. 1 Cor. vii. 15, ix. 5.
f Col. iv. 9, 17, 2 Tim. ii. 3.
g Phil. ii. 25, *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 3.
h Col. iv. 15.

[1] επιστολη πρ. φιλ. KL.
[2] αποστολος D*E*; δουλος 33[a].
[3] + αδελφω D*E.
[4] αγαπητη DKL, rec.; + charissimae Vulg., Pesh., Syr[hark], Chrys., Theod., Dam.

Ver. 1. **δέσμιος Χρ. Ἰησ.**: to St. Paul an even more precious title than the usual official **ἀπόστολος Χρ. Ἰησ.**; *cf.* v. 13, **ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγ.**, "they were not shackles which self had riveted, but a chain with which Christ had invested him; thus they were a badge of office . . . " (Lightfoot) This title of honour is chosen, and placed in the forefront of the Epistle, not with the idea of touching the heart of Philemon, but rather to proclaim the bondage in which every true Christian must be, and therefore also the "beloved fellow-worker" Philemon. The title is meant, in view of what follows in the Epistle, to touch the conscience rather than the heart.—**Τιμόθεος**: associated with St. Paul in Acts xix. 22, 2 Cor. i. 1, Phil. i. 1, Col. i. 1; his mention here points to his personal friendship with Philemon.—**ὁ ἀδελφός**: often used by the Apostle when he desires to be especially sympathetic; here, therefore, the emphasis is intended to be upon the thought of the brotherhood of all Christians; this is significant in view of the object of the Epistle.—**Φιλήμονι**: See Intr., § II. —**συνεργῷ**: when they had worked together cannot be said with certainty; perhaps in Ephesus or Colossae. Probably what is meant is the idea of all Christians being fellow-workers.

Ver. 2. **Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ**: A Phrygian name, often occurring on Phrygian inscriptions. It is most natural to suppose that she was the wife of Philemon; but she must have occupied also, most likely, a quasi-official position in the Church; **τῇ ἀδελφῇ**, coming between **συνεργῷ** and **συνστρατιώτῃ**, suggests this, especially when one remembers the important part the ministry of women played in the early Church, *cf.* the labours, *e.g.*, of Mary, Tryphaena and Tryphosa, Persis, in connexion with whom the semi-technical term **κοπιᾶν** is used (see 1 Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17, for the use of this word), and Prisca; on the whole subject see Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, i., pp. 122 f., 161 f., 363 f. (1908).—**Ἀρχίππῳ**: there is nothing to show that he was the son of Philemon, rather the contrary, for why should the son be addressed in a letter which dealt with one of his father's slaves? The inclusion of his name must be due to the fact that he occupied an important position in the local church (*cf.* the words which follow in the text), which was thus, in a certain sense, included in the responsibility with regard to Onesimus. Archippus occupied, apparently, a more important position than Philemon (see Col. iv. 17, **βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς**,—if Philemon had occupied any such official position mention would certainly have been made of it), but this would be most unlikely to have been the case if the latter had been the father of the former. It is more

i Rom. i. 18, οἰκόν σου ἐκκλησίᾳ [h]· 3. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς
1 Cor. i. 4,
Phil. i. 3, ἡμῶν [1] καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 4. [1] Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου [i]
1 Thess. i.
2, 2 Thess. πάντοτε [k] μνείαν σου ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, [k] 5. ἀκούων
i. 3.
k Rom. i. 10, σου τὴν [l] ἀγάπην καὶ [m] τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις [m] · [n] πρὸς [2] τὸν κύριον
Eph. i. 16,
1 Thess.
i. 2. l Phil. i. 9. m 1 Tim. i. 19. n *Cf.* 1 Thess. i. 8.

[1] Om. א[1]. [2] εἰς ACD*, WH.

natural to regard him as the head of the local Church, who lived in the house where the members met for worship (*cf.* Theodoret's words, quoted by Lightfoot: ὁ δὲ Ἄρχιππος τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτῶν ἐπεπίστευτο). — συνστρατιώτῃ: only elsewhere in N.T., Phil. ii. 25, but for the metaphor *cf.* 2 Cor. x. 3, 4, 1 Tim. i. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4,—καὶ τῇ κατ' οἶκον . . . : *Cf.* Acts xii. 12, Rom. xvi. 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, Col. iv. 15. Up to the third century we have no certain evidence of the existence of church buildings for the purposes of worship; all references point to private houses for this. In Rome several of the oldest churches appear to have been built on the sites of houses used for Christian worship; see Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 421, who quote this interesting passage from the *Acta Justini Martyris*, § 2 (Ruinart): "Quaesivit Praefectus, quem in locum Christiani convenirent. Cui respondit Justinus, eo unumquemque convenire quo vellet ac posset. An, inquit, existimas omnes nos in eundem locum convenire solitos? Minime res ita se habet . . . Tunc Praefectus: Age, inquit, dicas, quem in locum conveniatis, et discipulos tuos congreges. Respondit Justinus: Ego prope domum Martini cuiusdam, ad balneum cognomento Timiotinum, hactenus mansi."

Ver. 3. χάρις . . . εἰρήνη: *Cf.* Rom. i. 7, the usual Pauline greeting (exc. I. 2 Tim.); it is a combination of the Greek salutation, χαίρειν, and the Hebrew one, שָׁלוֹם. In the N.T. the word εἰρήνη expresses the spiritual state, which is the result of a right relationship between God and man. According to Jewish belief, the establishment of peace, in this sense, was one of the main functions of the Messiah (*cf.* Luke ii. 14), it was herein that His mediatorial work was to be accomplished. —πατρὸς: see note on Jas. iii. 9. The phrase ἀπὸ Θεοῦ . . . Χριστοῦ expresses the essence of Judaism and Christianity.

Ver. 4. πάντοτε: belongs to εὐχαριστῶ, *cf.* Eph. i. 16, Phil. i. 3, Col. i. 3, 4.

Ver. 5. ἀκούων: probably from Epaphras, see Col. i. 7, 8, iv. 12 (Lightfoot). —τὴν ἀγάπην . . .: *i.e.*, the faith which thou hast towards the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love which thou showest to all the saints. "The logical order," says Lightfoot, "is violated, and the clauses are inverted in the second part of the sentence, thus producing an example of the figure called chiasm; see Gal. iv. 4, 5. This results here from the apostle's setting down the thoughts in the sequence in which they occur to him, without paying regard to symmetrical arrangement. The first and prominent thought is Philemon's love. This suggests the mention of his faith, as the source from which it springs. This again requires a reference to the object of faith. And then, at length, comes the deferred sequel to the first thought—the range and comprehensiveness of his love."—πίστιν: not "faithfulness," but "faith" (belief), *cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 13, Gal. v. 6, 1 Thess. i. 3.—πρὸς . . . εἰς: the difference in these propositions is noteworthy, πρὸς refers to the "faith" to Christ-ward (*cf.* 1 Thess. i. 8), εἰς to the love to the saints; both are developed in vv. 6, 7.—τοὺς ἁγίους: St. Paul intends Onesimus to be thought of here. The original significance of the title ἅγιος, as applied to men, may be seen in such a phrase as, "Ye shall be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy" (Lev. xix. 2). To the Jew, like St. Paul, the corresponding root in Hebrew connoted the idea of something set apart, *i.e.*, consecrated to the service of God (*cf. e.g.*, Exod. xxii. 31 [29]). The ἅγιοι constituted originally the ἐκκλησία; and just as, according to the meaning underlying the Hebrew equivalent of the word ἅγιος, separation for God's service was the main conception, so, according to the root-meaning of ἐκκλησία, it connoted the idea of the body of those "called out," and thus separated from the world.

Ἰησοῦν [a 1] καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς [o] ἁγίους, 6. ὅπως ἡ [p] κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου [q] ἐνεργὴς γένηται ἐν [r] ἐπιγνώσει παντὸς [2] ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ [3] ἐν ἡμῖν [4] εἰς Χριστόν· [5] 7. χαρὰν [6] γὰρ [7] πολλὴν ἔσχον [7] καὶ [s] παράκλησιν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου, ὅτι τὰ [t] σπλάγχνα τῶν ἁγίων [u] ἀναπέπαυται διὰ σοῦ, [v] ἀδελφέ. 8. Διό, πολλὴν ἐν Χριστῷ [w] παρρησίαν ἔχων [8] [x] ἐπιτάσσειν σοι τὸ [y] ἀνῆκον. 9. διὰ τὴν [s] ἀγάπην [9] μᾶλλον [s] παρακαλῶ, τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς Παῦλος [a] πρεσβύτης,

o Eph. i. 1, etc.
p Phil. ii. 1.
q 1 Cor. xvi. 3, 9, Gal. v. 6, Heb. iv. 12.
r 1 Cor. i. 6, Eph. i. 17, Col. i. 29.
s 2 Cor. vii. 4, 2 Thess. ii. 6.
t 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 2 Cor. vi. 12, vii. 13, 15, Phil. i. 8.
u Matt. xi. 28, 1 Cor. xvi. 18, 2 Cor. vii. 13.
v Gal. vi. 18.
w 2 Cor. iii. 12, Eph. iii. 12, Phil. i. 20.
x Mk. i. 27, vi. 27, 39, ix. 25.
y Eph. v. 4, Col. iii. 18.
z Eph. iv. 1.
a Luke i. 18, Tit. ii. 2.

[1] + χριστον D^1, aeth.
[2] + εργου FG, a, c, e, g, Vulg.
[3] Om. AC.
[4] υμιν ℵFGP, curss., Syrr., $Vulg^A$, rec.
[5] + Ιησουν ℵ^{c}DFGKLP, m, Vulg.
[6] χαριν KL, a, $Vulg^F$, rec., Chrys., Theod., Dam., Thl.
[7—7] εχομεν πολλεν DCKL, a, m, Pesh., Syr^{hark}, $Vulg^F$, rec.; πολλεν εχω a.
[8] Habentes $Vulg^{F1}$.
[9] αναγκην A.

Ver. 6. **ὅπως**: belongs to **μνείαν σου ποιούμενος . . .** v. 5 is, as it were, in brackets. It would be more usual to have **ἵνα** here.—**κοινωνία**: the reference is to identity of faith; the fellowship among the saints, *cf.* Phil. i. 5. The word is used of a collection of money in Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13; *cf.* Heb. xiii. 16.—**ἐν**: see 2 Cor. i. 6, Col. i. 29. —**ἐπιγνώσει**: the force of this word is seen in Phil. i. 9.—**παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ**: *cf.* Rom. xii. 2, xvi. 19, Col. i. 9.—**ἐν ἡμ. εἰς Χρ.**: it is not only a question of men who benefit by "every good thing," but also of the relationship to Christ; *cf.* Col. iii. 23.

Ver. 7. **ἔσχον**: the aorist expresses forcibly the moment of joy which St. Paul experienced when he heard this good news about Philemon.—**τὰ σπλάγχνα**: regarded as the seat of the emotions.—**ἀναπέπαυται**: the compound "expresses a temporary relief, the simple **παύεσθαι** expresses a final cessation" (Lightfoot).—**ἀδελφέ**: the place of the word here makes it emphatic, *cf.* Gal. vi. 18, Phil. iv. 1.

Ver. 8. **Διό**: *i.e.*, because of the good that he has heard concerning Philemon; he must keep up his reputation.—**ἐπιτάσσειν**: "to enjoin," or "command"; the word is used "rather of commanding which attaches to a definite office and relates to permanent obligations under the office, than of special injunctions for particular occasions" (Vincent).—**τὸ ἀνῆκον**: the primary meaning of the verb is that of "having arrived at," or "reached"; and, ultimately, that of fulfilling a moral obligation. The word occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Ephes. v. 4, Col. iii. 18.

Ver. 9. **τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς**: "**τοιοῦτος** can be defined only by a following adjective, or by **οἷος, ὅς, ὅσος,** or **ὥστε** with the infinitive; never by **ὡς**" (Vincent). It seems, therefore, best to take **τοιοῦτος ὢν** as referring to **. . . μᾶλλον παρακλῶ,** which is taken up again in the next verse; **ὡς Παῦλος . . . Ἰησοῦ** must be regarded as though in brackets; **τοιοῦτος ὢν** would then mean "one who beseeches". —**πρεσβύτης**: this can scarcely be in reference to age, for which **γέρων** would be more likely to have been used; besides, in Acts vii. 58, at the martyrdom of St. Stephen, the term **νεανίας** is applied to St. Paul. Lightfoot in his interesting note on this verse, says: "There is reason for thinking that in the common dialect **πρεσβύτης** may have been written indifferently for **πρεσβευτής** in St. Paul's time; and if so, the form here may be due, not to some comparatively late scribe, but to the original autograph itself or to an immediate transcript"; and he gives a number of instances of the form **πρεσβύτης** being used for **πρεσβευτής.** If, as seems very likely, we should translate the word "ambassador" here, then we have the striking parallel in the contemporary epistle to the Ephesians, vi. 20, **ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβεύω ἐν ἁλύσει.** Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 273) points out that both the verb **πρεσβεύω,** and the substantive **πρεσβευτής,** were used in the Greek Orient for expressing the title of the Legatus of the emperor. Accepting the meaning "ambassador" here, the significance of

b 1 Cor. iv. 14, Gal iv. 19, 1 Tim. i. 2. c 1 Cor. iv. 15, Gal. iv. 19. d Phil. i. 7. e Col. iv. 9. f Gal. i. 13. g Col. i. 21. h 2 Tim. ii. 21. i Luke xxiii. 11. k Luke iv. 22.

b 1 Cor. iv. 14, Gal iv. 19, 1 Tim. i. 2. c 1 Cor. iv. 15, Gal. iv. 19. d Phil. i. 7. e Col. iv. 9. f Gal. i. 13. g Col. i. 21. h 2 Tim. ii. 21. i Luke xxiii. 11. k Luke iv. 22.

[1] Om. **Ιησου** D[1]; **Ιησου χριστου** rec. [2] Pr. **εγω** A, m.

[3] + **μου** ℵ[c]CDEKLP, a, Syrr., rec.

[4] Om. **και** AKCDKLP, Pesh., rec., WH.

[5—5] **ανεπεμψα σου δε αυτον** DE, a, rec.; remisi tibi. Tu autem illum Vulg.

[6—6] Ut Vulg[A]; id est Vulg[F].

[7] + **προσλαβου** CD, a, rec. (*cf.* v. 17); + suscipe Vulg.; the Pesh. reads "my son" for **τα εμα σπλ.**

the passage is much increased; for Christ's ambassador had the right to command, but in merely exhorting he throws so much more responsibility on Philemon. The word "ambassador" would be at least as strong an assertion of authority as "apostle"; to a Greek, indeed, more so.—**δέσμιος**: perhaps mentioned for the purpose of hinting that in respect of bondage his position was not unlike that of him for whom he is about to plead; *cf.* the way in which St. Paul identifies himself with Onesimus in vv. 12 . . . **αὐτόν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα**, and 17 . . . **ὡς ἐμέ.—Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**: belongs both to **πρεσβύτης** and to **δέσμιος**, *cf.* v. 1, Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1, 2 Tim. i. 8.

Ver. 10. **ὃν ἐγέννησα**: *cf. Sanhedrin*, xix. 2 (Jer. Talm.), "If one teaches the son of his neighbour the Law, the Scripture reckons this the same as if he had begotten him" (quoted by Vincent).—**Ὀνήσιμον**: one would expect **Ὀνησίμου** it is attracted to **ὃν . . .** instead of agreeing with **τοῦ ἐμοῦ τέκνου.** He is to be **ὀνήσιμος** in future, no longer **ἀνόνητος.—ἄχρηστον**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T., but used in the Septuagint, Hos. viii. 8, 2 Macc. vii. 5, Wisd. ii. 11, iii. 11, Sir. xvi. 1, xxvii. 19. As applied to Onesimus the reference must be to something wrong done by him; the fear of being punished for this was presumably his reason for running away from his master.—**νυνὶ δὲ**: a thoroughly Pauline expression, *cf.* v. 9, Rom. vi. 22, vii. 6, 17, xv. 23, 25, 1 Cor. v. 11, etc.—**εὔχρηστον**: only elsewhere in N.T. in 2 Tim. ii. 21, iv. 11.

Ver. 12. **ὃν ἀνέπεμψά σοι**: the aorist, in accordance with the epistolary style. It is clear from these words that Onesimus himself was the bearer of the letter, *cf.* Col. iv. 7-9. On St. Paul's insistence that Onesimus should return to his master, see Intr. § III.—**αὐτόν**: note the emphatic position of this word, *cf.* Eph. i. 22.—**ἐμὰ**: again emphatic in thus preceding the noun.

Ver. 13. **ἐγὼ**: a further emphatic mode of expression.—**ἐβουλόμην**: **βούλεσθαι** connotes the idea of purpose, **θέλειν** simply that of willing. The differences between the tenses—**ἐβουλόμην** and **ἐθέλησα** (ver. 14)—is significant; "the imperfect implies a tentative, inchoate process; while the aorist describes a definite complete act. The will stepped in and put an end to the inclinations of the mind" (Lightfoot).—**κατέχειν**: "to detain," directly opposed to **ἀπέχῃς** in ver. 15. Deissmann (*Op cit.*, p. 222) points out that **κατέχω** is often used in papyri and on ostraka of *binding*, though in a magical sense.—**ὑπὲρ σοῦ**: "in thy stead," the implication being that Philemon is placed under an obligation to his slave; for the force of **ὑπὲρ** as illustrated on the papyri, etc., see Deissmann's important remarks on pp. 105, 241 ff. of his work already quoted.—**διακονῇ**: used in the Pauline Epistles both of Christian ministration generally (Rom. xi. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 5; Eph. iv. 12) and in special reference to bodily wants, such as alms can supply (1 Cor. xvi. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 4).—**ἐν τοῖς δεσμ. τοῦ εὐαγγ.**: *i.e.*, the bonds which the Gospel had tied, and which necessitated his being ministered unto.—**τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**: see Mark i. 14, 15 and *cf.* Matt. iv. 23; Christ uses the word often in reference to the Messianic Era. "The earliest instances of the use of **εὐαγγέλιον** in the sense of a book would be: Did. 8, 11, 15 *bis*; Ign.

[l]διακονῇ ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 14. χωρὶς δὲ τῆς σῆς [m]γνώμης οὐδὲν ἠθέλησα ποιῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατὰ [n]ἀνάγκην τὸ ἀγαθόν σου ᾖ ἀλλὰ κατὰ [1]ἑκούσιον. 15. [o]τάχα γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο [p]ἐχωρίσθη πρὸς ὥραν, ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν [q]ἀπέχῃς, 16. οὐκέτι ὡς δοῦλον [2]ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ δοῦλον,[2] [r]ἀδελφὸν [3] ἀγαπητόν, [s]μάλιστα ἐμοί, [t]πόσῳ δὲ μᾶλλον σοὶ καὶ [u]ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ [v]ἐν κυρίῳ. 17. εἰ οὖν με ἔχεις [w]κοινωνόν, [x]προσλαβοῦ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ. 18. εἰ δὲ τι [y]ἠδίκησέν σε ἢ [z]ὀφείλει, τοῦτο ἐμοὶ [a]ἐλλόγα·[4] 19. [b]ἐγὼ Παῦλος ἔγραψα τῇ

l Matt. xxvii. 55, Acts xix. 22, Rom. xv. 25, Heb. vi. 10.
m Acts xx. 3.
n 2 Cor. ix. 7, Heb. vii. 12.
o Rom. v. 7.
p 1 Cor. vii. 11, 15.
q Matt. v. 16, vi. 2,
r Phil. iv. 18. iii. 16.
s 1 Tim. iv. 10.
t Rom. xi. 12, 24.
u 1 Tim. 3, xv. 7.
v Rom. xvi. 2, Phil. ii. 29.
w 1 Cor. x. 18, 20.
x Acts xxviii. 2, Rom. xiv. 1,
y Matt. xx. 13, 1 Cor. vi. 8.
z Matt. xviii. 28.
a Rom. v. 13.
b Gal. vi. 11, 2 Thess. iii. 17.

[1] Om. D. [2—2] Om. F. [3] Om. ℵ[1]. [4] ελλογει KL, rec.

Philad. 5, 8 (Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 319).

Ver. 14. With the thought of this verse *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 7, 1 Peter v. 2.—**ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην**: "St. Paul does not say **κατὰ ἀνάγκην** but **ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην**. He will not suppose that it would really be constraint; but it must not even wear the *appearance* (**ὡς**) of being so. *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 17, **ὡς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ**" (Lightfoot).

Ver. 15. **ἐχωρίσθη**: a very delicate way of putting it.—**πρὸς ὥραν**: *cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 8, Gal. ii. 5.—**αἰώνιον**: there is no reason why this should not be taken in a literal sense, the reference being to Onesimus as **ἀδελφὸν ἀγαπητόν**, not as **δοῦλον**.—**ἀπέχῃς**: *cf.* Phil. iv. 18, although the idea of restitution is prominent here, that of complete possession seems also to be present in view of **αἰώνιον** and **ἀδελφὸν ἀγαπ.**, but see further Intr., § III.

Ver. 16. **οὐκέτι ὡς δοῦλον**: no longer in the character of a slave, according to the world's acceptation of the term, though still a slave (see, however, the note on v. 21); but the relationship between slave and master were in this instance to become altered.—**πόσῳ δὲ μᾶλλον . . .**: *i.e.*, more than most of all (which he had been to St. Paul) to thee.—With the thought of the verse *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 2.

Ver. 17. **ἔχεις . . .**: for this use of **ἔχω** *cf.* Luke xiv. 18, Phil. ii. 29.—**κοινωνόν**: for the idea see Rom. xii. 13, xv. 26 f., 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13, Gal. vi. 6, Phil. iv. 15, 1 Tim. vi. 18, Heb. xiii. 16.—**προσλαβοῦ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ**: *cf.* **τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα** in v. 12. An interesting parallel (given by Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 128 f.) occurs in a papyrus of the second century, written in Latin by a freedman, Aurelius Archelaus, to the military tribune, Julius Domitius: "Already once before have I commended unto thee my friend Theon. And now again, I pray thee, my lord, that he may be in thy sight as I myself" (ut eum ant' oculos habeas tanquam me).

Ver. 18. **εἰ δὲ τι**: as Lightfoot says, the case is stated hypothetically, but the words doubtless describe the actual offence of Onesimus.—**ἐλλόγα**: only elsewhere in N.T. in Rom. v. 13; it occurs on the papyri (Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 52), "to reckon unto"; here, in the sense: "put it down to my account".

Ver. 19. **ἐγὼ Παῦλος**: "The introduction of his own name gives it the character of a formal and binding signature, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 21, Col. iv. 18, 2 Thess. iii. 17" (Lightfoot).—**ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ ἀποτίσω**: **ἔγρ.** epistolary aorist, *cf.* 1 Pet. v. 12, 1 John ii. 14, 21, 26. Deissmann (*op. cit.*, p. 239) calls attention to the large number of papyri which are acknowledgments of debt (Schuldhandschrift); a stereotyped phrase which these contain is, "I will repay," usually expressed by **ἀποδώσω**; in case the debtor is unable to write a representative who can do so expressly adds, "I have written this for him". The following is an example: ". . . which we also will repay . . . besides whatever else there is (**ἄλλων ὤν**) which we owe over and above . . . I, Papos, write it for him, because he cannot write". See also Deissmann's *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 67, under **χειρόγραφον**. It seems certain from the words **ἔγραψα . . .** (*cf.* also v. 21) that St. Paul wrote the whole of this epistle himself; this was quite exceptional, as he usually employed an

c 2 Cor. ix. 4. d Phil. iv. 3. e *Cf.* Sir. xxx. 2. f Rom. xvi. 7, 9. g Phil. i. 14. h Rom. i. 5. 1 Cor. vii. 15, x. 5, 6, Heb. v. 8, 1 Pet. i. 2, 14, 22. i 2 Tim. ii. 21, 1 Cor. ii. 9, Heb. xi. 16. k Acts xxviii. 23. l Rom. xii. 3, Gal. i. 18, Phil. i. 19. m Acts iii. 14, xxvii. 24, 1 Cor. ii. 12. n Col. i. 7, iv. 12. o Rom. xvi. 7, Col. iv. 10. p Col. iv. 10. q Acts xxvii. 2.

ἐμῇ χειρί, [b] ἀποτίσω· [c] ἵνα μὴ λέγω [c] σοι ὅτι καὶ σεαυτόν μοι προσο-
[d] φέιλεις.[1] 20. [d] ναί, ἀδελφέ, ἐγώ σου [e] ὀναίμην ἐν κυρίῳ· ἀνάπαυ-
[e] σόν μου τὰ σπλάγχνα [f] ἐν Χριστῷ.[2] 21. [g] Πεποιθὼς τῇ [h] ὑπακοῇ
[f] σου ἔγραψά σοι, εἰδὼς ὅτι καὶ ὑπὲρ ἃ[3] λέγω ποιήσεις. 22. ἅμα
[g] δὲ καὶ [h] [i] ἑτοίμαζέ μοι [k] ξενίαν· ἐλπίζω γὰρ ὅτι [l] διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν
[m] ὑμῶν [m] χαρισθήσομαι ὑμῖν. 23. [n] Ἀσπάζεταί[4] σε [n] Ἐπαφρᾶς ὁ
[o] συναιχμάλωτός μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 24. [p] Μάρκος, [q] Ἀρίσταρχος,

[1] + εν κυριω D*E*. [2] κυριω EK, a, rec.
[3] ο DE, a, rec. [4] ασπαζονται KL, a, rec.

amanuensis; the quasi-private character of the letter would account for this. See, further, Lightfoot's note on Gal. vi. 11. —**ἀποτίσω**: a stronger form than the more usual **ἀποδώσω**. As a matter of fact St. Paul, in a large measure, had repaid whatever was due to Philemon by being the means whereby the latter received his slave back, but see Intr. § III. —**ἵνα μὴ λέγω σοι**: a kind of mental ejaculation, as though St. Paul were speaking to himself; the **σοι** does not properly belong to the phrase; *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 4.—**καὶ σεαυτόν**: the reference is to Philemon's conversion, either directly due to St. Paul, or else indirectly through the mission into Asia Minor, which had been the means whereby Philemon had become a Christian; in either case St. Paul could claim Philemon as his spiritual child in the sense that he did in the case of Onesimus (see v. 10).—**μοι προσοφείλεις**: "thou owest me over and above". See further, on **ὀφειλή**, Deissmann, *Neue Bibelst.*, p. 48, *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 46, 239.

Ver. 20. **ναί**: *cf.* Phil. iv. 3, **ναὶ ἐρωτῶ καὶ σέ**.—**ἀδελφέ**: an affectionate appeal, *cf.* Gal. iii. 15, vi. 1-18.—**ἐγώ**: "The emphatic **ἐγώ** identifies the cause of Onesimus with his own" (Lightfoot). —**σου ὀναίμην**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T., it occurs once in the Septuagint (Ecclus. xxx. 2), and several times in the Ignatian Epp. (Eph. ii. 2, Magn. ii. 12, Rom. v. 2, Pol. i. 1, vi. 2). **Ὀν.** is a play on the name Onesimus, lit., "May I have profit of thee"; Lightfoot says that the common use of the word **ὀναίμην** would suggest the thought of filial offices, and gives a number of instances of its use. It is the only proper optative in the N.T. which is not in the third person (Moulton, *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, p. 195).—**ἀνάπαυσον**: see note on v. 7. —**ἐν Χριστῷ**: St. Paul refers to the real source from which the **ἀναπαύειν** gets its strength.

Ver. 21. **τῇ ὑπακοῇ σου**: a hint regarding the authority which St. Paul has a right to wield.—**ἔγραψα**: see note on v. 19.—**ὑπὲρ ἃ**: as it stands this is quite indefinite, but there is much point in Lightfoot's supposition that the thought of the manumission of Philemon was in St. Paul's mind; "throughout this epistle the idea would seem to be present to his thoughts, though the word never passes his lips. This reserve is eminently characteristic of the Gospel. Slavery is never directly attacked as such, but principles are inculcated which must prove fatal to it."—**λέγω**: note the tense here, a very vivid touch after **ἔγραψα**.

Ver. 22. **ἅμα . . .** *i.e.*, at the same time that he does what he is going to do for Onesimus. **ἑτοίμαζέ μοι**: Lightfoot's remark that "there is a gentle compulsion in this mention of a personal visit to Colossae," does not seem justified in view of the stress that St. Paul lays on Philemon's action being wholly voluntary, see vv. 10, 14; it is more probable that this is merely an incidental mention of what had been planned some time before, namely another missionary journey to Asia Minor and Greece (see Phil. ii. 24), without any thought of influencing Philemon's action thereby.—**ξενίαν**: only here and in Acts xxviii. 23, in the N.T.

Ver. 23. **συναιχμάλωτος**: lit. "a prisoner of war," used metaphorically like **συνστρατιώτης**, see note on ver. 2; *cf.* Rom. xvi. 7, where the word is used in reference to Andronicus and Junius.

Ver. 24. **Μάρκος**: *i.e.*, John Mark, *cf.* Acts xii. 25, xv. 37, Phil. iv. 10; he

[r] Δημᾶς, [r] Λουκᾶς, οἱ [s] συνεργοί μου. 25. Ἡ [t] χάρις τοῦ [1] κυρίου
[3] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ [u] πνεύματος ὑμῶν.[2]

r Col. iv. 14. s Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21, 1 Cor. iii. 9.

t Col. iv. 18. u Gal. vi. 18, Phil. iv. 23, 2 Tim. iv. 22.

[1] + ημων Vulg., rec. [2] + αμην ℵC, m, Vulg., rec.

Subscr.: προς Φιλημονα (και Απφιαν δεσποτας Ονησιμου και προς Αρχιππον το νδιακονον της εν Κολοσσαις εκκλησιας) εγραφη απο Ρωμης (δια Ονησιμου οικετου). [Αλλα δη και μαρτυς Χριστου γεγενηται ο μακαριος Ονησιμος εν τη Ρωμαιων πολει επι Τερτουλλου τηνικαυτα την επαρχικην εξουσιαν διεποντος τη των σκελων κλασει την ψηφον υπομεινας του μαρτυριον].

and Aristarchus were Jewish-Christians (Col. iv. 11).—**Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς**: Gentile Christians (*cf.* Acts xvi. 10, xx. 5, 6, xxi. 15, xxvii. 2); the former name is a contraction of **Δημήτριος** (Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 10).

Ver. 25. **Ἡ χάρις**: *cf.* Gal. vi. 18, 2 Tim. iv. 22.—**ὑμῶν**: the reference is both to those addressed by name in the opening of the Epistle, as well as to the members of the local Church, see verse 2. This final verse is a reiteration of the grace pronounced in verse 3.

THE EPISTLE

TO THE

HEBREWS

INTRODUCTION.

History of the Epistle. The early history of this Epistle has already been so fully narrated in various accessible volumes, that a bare outline may here suffice. Its chief interest is the illustration it gives of the difficulties which an anonymous book had to overcome before it won for itself a place in the Canon. The significance of the story of its fortunes may be gathered from the statement of Eusebius:[1] "Paul's fourteen Epistles are well known and undisputed. It is not indeed right to overlook the fact that some have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, saying that it is disputed by the Church of Rome on the ground that it was not written by Paul." The Church, that is to say, looked with suspicion, or at any rate hesitation, on any candidate for canonical honours which had not the authentication of apostolic authorship. And although the Epistle to the Hebrews *really* won for itself a place in the Canon by its intrinsic merit, by its cardinal importance as the final adjustment of the Jewish and Christian dispensations, as well as by its marked ability and felicitous style, yet it had to steal into its place under the cloak of an apostle, and it is doubtful whether it would have won universal acceptance had it not been attached, loosely enough it is true, to the collection of Paul's Epistles. Even though there was no certainty regarding its authorship in any part of the church, and in some parts a distinct and expressed conviction that it was not from the hand of Paul, yet obviously it was too rich a treasure to lose; and because it was not unworthy of the great apostle nor wholly alien from his way of thinking, it was allowed to attach itself to his Epistles, and so, happily, found a place in the Canon.

The difficulty to which Eusebius alludes, as experienced by the Western or Latin Church, was of ancient date. For although the earliest traces of the use of the Epistle are found in Clement of Rome (*c.* 96 A.D.) who betrays familiarity with it, yet no Western writer of the second century acknowledges it as canonical. It was not included in the collection of Pauline Epistles which Marcion

[1] *H. E.*, iii. 3.

formed in the first half of that century, and Tertullian, though objecting to his omission of the Pastoral Epistles, makes no remark upon his rejection of Hebrews. In the latter half of the century Roman opinion is represented by the Muratorian canon, which makes no mention of the Epistle at all, unless, as some have fancied, it is alluded to as that "ad Alexandrinos".[1] The prevalent Roman opinion is represented by the presbyter Caius who did not accept the Epistle as Pauline.[2] According to Photius, Hippolytus also denied the Pauline authorship; and in the earliest Old Latin Version the Epistle was omitted.

In the North African branch of the Latin Church not only was the Pauline authorship denied, but the Epistle was definitely ascribed to Barnabas. Tertullian (*De Pudic.*, c. 20) in citing Hebrews vi. 4-8 claims for the Epistle only a subordinate authority ["idoneum *confirmandi de proximo jure* disciplinam magistrorum"] because it was written not by an apostle, but by a "comes apostolorum," whom he unhesitatingly speaks of as Barnabas.

Meanwhile, however, in the Eastern Church the Pauline authorship was maintained. The Syrian Church accepted the Epistle into its earliest canon; and even if translated by a different and later hand than the other Epistles, this cannot be ascribed to any reluctance to receive it as canonical.[3] In Alexandria towards the close of the second century it is accepted as Pauline by Pantaenus and Clement.[4] But as criticism was cultivated with some diligence in this Church, it could not escape notice that both in its anonymity and in its style this Epistle differed from those of Paul. The absence of the usual Pauline address Pantaenus explained as due to the modesty of the Apostle, who would not even seem to usurp the place which belonged to the Lord Himself as Apostle of the Hebrews.[5] Clement accounted for the difference in style by the supposition that the Epistle was originally written by Paul in Hebrew and afterwards translated by Luke, while the absence of signature is referred to the natural fear lest the name of the Apostle of the Gentiles might repel Hebrew readers. The opinion in which the Church of Alexandria in general rested may be gathered from the words of Origen:[6] "If I

[1] "Fertur etiam ad Laodicenses, alia ad Alexandrinos Pauli nomine fictae ad haeresem Marcionis, et alia plura, quae in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest; fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit."

[2] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 20. Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.*, c. 59.

[3] Dr. Bewer (*A. J. T.*, April, 1900, p. 358) dates its introduction to the Syrian canon in the third century.

[4] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 14.

[5] Adopted by Jerome, *Ep. ad Gal.*

[6] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25.

gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the Apostle, but the phrasing and composition are those of some one who remembered what the teacher had said. If then any church holds this Epistle to be Paul's, let it be commended for this. For not without reason (εἰκῇ) have our predecessors (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες) handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote the Epistle, in truth God knows. The account that has reached us is, that some say it was written by Clement who became bishop of the Romans, while others ascribed it to Luke, the author of the Gospel and Acts."

Unsatisfactory as such a decision was, the idea that the Epistle was Paul's generally [1] prevailed over the whole Church, so that from the fifth century to the reformation, there were few who took the trouble to inquire. The conversion of the Latin Church to this opinion was mainly due to the influence of Augustine and Jerome. The formulæ under which the latter writer cited the Epistle reveal his personal dubiety. "The Epistle which, under the name of Paul, is written to the Hebrews." "He who writes to the Hebrews." "The Apostle Paul, or whoever else wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews." "The Apostle Paul in the Epistle to Hebrews, which the Latin custom does not receive." He mentions that the Greek writers accept it as Paul's, although many ascribe it either to Barnabas or Clement.[2] It would apparently, have taken little to persuade Jerome that the latter opinion was well-grounded, for he had himself noticed a striking similarity between the Epistle of Clement and that to the Hebrews.[3] In short, we find that Jerome acted in regard to this Epistle on the principle he carried through his formation of the Vulgate canon, the principle that it was better to include than to exclude a good book and that prevalent opinion must be allowed a great weight.

Instructive also is Augustine's treatment of the Epistle. Sometimes he reckons it among Paul's, sometimes he cites it anonymously ["epistola quae ad Hebraeos inscribitur," or "est"]; sometimes he calls attention to the doubts entertained regarding it by others, but professes that for his part he is moved by the authority of the Eastern Churches. The facile and uncritical spirit of the time is conspicuous in the manner in which the councils of North Africa dealt with this

[1] For exceptions in the Western Church, see Westcott On *the Canon*, p. 401.

[2] "Licet plerique eam vel Barnabae vel Clementis arbitrentur," *Ep. ad. Dardanum.*

[3] "Clemens scripsit . . . utilem epistolam . . . quae mihi videtur characteri epistolae, quae sub Pauli nomine ad Hebraeos fertur, convenire," *De Vir. Illus.*, c. 15.

Epistle. In the council of Hippo in 393, while Augustine was still a presbyter, and in the third council of Carthage, held in 398, the prevalent dubiety regarding the authorship of Hebrews found expression in the enumeration of the New Testament books, "of the Apostle Paul, thirteen Epistles, of the same to the Hebrews, one". But in the fifth council of Carthage, in 419, where Augustine was also present, this feeble and meaningless distinction is abandoned and the enumeration boldly runs, "of the Epistles of Paul in number fourteen".

It is not easy to determine how much or how little we are justified in concluding from these early opinions and traditions. That the ecclesiastical voice gradually settled upon the great name of Paul, if it does not do much credit to the critical sagacity of the Early Church, at least shows that no other name was satisfactory. That Clement should have been mentioned as a possible author, naturally results from the abundant and free use he makes of the Epistle, as well as from his friendship with Paul, and his position as a writer of repute. That Paul's still more prominent ally, Barnabas, should have been credited with the Epistle was possibly the result of its quite superficial resemblance to the well-known and widely-read but spurious *Epistle of Barnabas*. Evidently, however, it is the Epistle itself which must divulge the secret of its authorship if we are at all to ascertain it.

Authorship. The bare reading of the Epistle suffices to convince us that the Pauline authorship may be set aside as incredible. The style is not Paul's, and this Apostle although using an amanuensis, undoubtedly dictated all his letters. The Epistle to the Hebrews reveals a literary felicity not found elsewhere in the New Testament. The writer is master of his words, and perfectly understands how to arrange each clause so that every word shall play its full part in conveying with precision the meaning intended. He knows how to build up his sentences into concise paragraphs, each of which carries the argument one stage nearer to its conclusion. He avoids all irrelevant digressions. His earnestness of purpose never betrays him into carelessness of language, but only serves to give edge and point to its exact use. In all this he markedly and widely differs from the tempestuousness of Paul. As Farrar says: "The writer cites differently from St. Paul; he writes differently; he argues differently; he thinks differently; he declaims differently; he constructs and connects his sentences differently; he builds up his paragraphs on a wholly different model. St. Paul is constantly mingling two constructions, leaving sentences unfinished, breaking

into personal allusions, substituting the syllogism of passion for the syllogism of logic. This writer is never ungrammatical, he is never irregular, he is never personal, he never struggles for expression; he never loses himself in a parenthesis; he is never hurried into an anacoluthon. His style is the style of a man who thinks as well as writes in Greek; whereas St. Paul wrote in Greek but thought in Syriac." The same difference was felt by those who themselves used the Greek language. Thus Origen[1] says: "That the verbal style of the Epistle entitled 'to the Hebrews' is not rude like the language of the Apostle who acknowledged himself 'rude in speech,' that is, in expression; but that its diction is purer Greek, any one who has the power to discern differences of phraseology will acknowledge."[2]

But if the style puts it beyond question that Paul cannot have been the immediate author of the Epistle is it not possible to believe with Origen that "the thoughts are those of the Apostle"? This also must be answered in the negative. There is in the Epistle nothing discordant with Pauline doctrine, but its argument moves on different lines and in a different atmosphere from those with which the Apostle to the Gentiles makes us familiar. This is most readily discerned when we consider the attitude held by the two authors respectively to the fundamental idea of Jewish religion, the Law. Paul views the Mosaic economy mainly as a law commanding and threatening. The writer to the Hebrews views it rather as a vast congeries of institutions, observances and promises. To the one writer the Law is mainly juridical; to the other it is ceremonial. To the ardent spirit of Paul athirst for righteousness, the Law with its impracticable precepts had become a nightmare, the embodiment of all that barred access to God and life. The grace of Christianity throwing open the gates of righteousness was the antithesis and

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25.

[2] "Diversity of style is more easily felt by the reader than expressed by the critic, without at least a tedious analysis of language; one simple and tangible test presents itself, however, in the use of connecting particles, inasmuch as these determine the structure of sentences. A minute comparison of these possesses therefore real importance in the differentiation of language. Now in the Epistles of St. Paul εἴ τις occurs fifty times, εἴτε sixty-three, ποτε (in affimative clauses) nineteen, εἶτα (in enumerations) six, εἰ δὲ καὶ, four, εἴπερ five, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ three, εἴγε four, μήπως twelve, μηκέτι ten, μενοῦνγε three, ἐάν eighty-eight times, while none of them are found in the Epistle except ἐάν and that only once (or twice), except in quotations. On the other hand, ὅθεν which occurs six times and ἐάνπερ which occurs three times in the Epistle are never used by St. Paul." Rendall's *Theol. of Hebrew Christianity*, p. 27.

abolition of the law. But to this writer, brought up in a more latitudinarian school and of a quieter temperament, the law was not this inexorable taskmaster, but rather a system of type and symbol foreshadowing the perfect fellowship with God secured by Christianity and revealed in Him. Both writers have the same question before them: What gives Christianity its power to bring men into harmony with God and thus constitutes it the universal, permanent religion? What precisely is the relation of this new form of religion to that out of which it sprang and which it supersedes? Paul boldly enounces the incompatibility of faith and works, of grace and merit, of Christianity and the Law. This writer, adopting a method and a view more likely to conciliate the Jew, aims at exhibiting the work of Christianity as that towards which the previous economy had been striving, that the two are essentially connected, and that without Christianity Judaism remains imperfect.[1]

So that Pfleiderer's remark is justified, when he says, "this is a thoroughly original attempt to establish the most essential results of Paulinism upon new presuppositions and in an entirely independent way—a way which proceeds upon lines of thought regarding the constitution of the universe which were widely spread amongst the educated people of that time, and which necessarily had far greater power of diffusing enlightenment than the dialectic of the old Pauline system which was so highly wrought up to an individual standpoint."[2]

Here and there the ideas and expressions of Paul seem to be coloured by the Alexandrian system and manner of thought, which, as Pfleiderer says, influenced the entire educated world of the time; but in the mind of Paul there lay a deeper soil in which had been sown the governing ideas of Palestinian or Pharisaic theology. The work and person of Christ are presented under different categories by the two writers: the priestly function, which is absent or almost so from the letters of Paul, dominates the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In keeping with this, the idea of sacrifice which colours the whole of the latter Epistle, only occasionally emerges in the Pauline writings. So too it is the kingly state of the risen Christ which occupies the one writer, while in the mind of the other it is a priestly exaltation that is conspicuous. And thus the δικαιοῦν of Paul becomes in Hebrews ἁγιάζειν, or καθαρίζειν or τελειοῦν; and the leading religious terms "faith" "grace" and so forth have

[1] *Cf.* Ménégoz (*Théol. de l'ep. aux Heb.*, 190) "L'un abolit la Loi, l'autre la transfigure"; and p. 197, the one was revolutionist, the other evolutionist. See also Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, ii., p. 286 ff. Verhältniss zum Paulinismus.

[2] *Paulinism*, E. Tr., ii., 53.

one meaning in Paul and another in this Epistle. Evidently the suggestion that Luke was on this occasion Paul's interpreter is quite insufficient to satisfy the conditions.[1]

If the Epistle cannot be ascribed to Paul, must we fall back upon Tertullian's statement,[2] and accept Barnabas as the author? This solution cannot be said to have ever been prevalent in the early Church, notwithstanding the meagre references unearthed by Prof. Bartlet and Mr. Ayles. Over against these references may be set the significant words of Jerome, who designates this ascription of authorship as "juxta Tertullianum," apparently implying that in all his vast store of information he had found no one else holding this opinion. Origen, too, knows nothing of such a tradition. It was, however, revived in the seventeenth century by the Scottish scholar, Cameron, and in more recent times has found supporters in Ritschl, Weiss, Renan, Salmon and Vernon Bartlet.[3] Zahn, who formerly advocated the same authorship, is now less certain. The claims of Barnabas are also urged with fulness and force by Mr. Ayles in an essay devoted to this object.[4] There can be no doubt that Barnabas answers many of the requirements which must be met by any presumed author of the Epistle. He belonged to the circle of Paul and was a man of character and of capacity; he was a Levite and as such predisposed to consider the Christ and His work in its bearing on the Old Testament ritual;[5] he was a native of Cyprus where good Greek was spoken, and at the same time was well known and influential in the Church at Jerusalem. The tradition that Mark, his nephew, introduced the Gospel into Alexandria, might be pressed to indicate some connection with that centre of thought. This, however, tells also against his authorship, for it is unaccountable that Barnabas' name should have been lost in the Church where his nephew presided. It must also be kept in view that the association

[1] The similarities to the usage of Luke in the vocabulary of the Epistle have been examined with final thoroughness by Prof. Frederic Gardiner in the *Journal of Soc. of Bibl. Lit. and Exegesis* for June 1887. See also Alexander's *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, 3rd ed., pp. 302-324; and W. H. Simcox in the *Expositor* for 1888.

[2] *De Pudicitia*, c. 20. "Extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, adeo satis auctoritati viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore (1 Cor. ix. 6); et utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum."

[3] *Expositor*, 1902.

[4] *Destination, Date and Authorship of Ep. to Heb.* (Cambridge, 1899).

[5] For supposed mistakes regarding the Temple and its service, *cf.* Zahn, ii., 55,156.

of Barnabas with the Church at Jerusalem only tells in his favour if that be considered the destination of the Epistle. It is, of course, a mere accident that his designation, υἱὸς παρακλήσεως (Acts iv. 36) should correspond with the description of this Epistle as a λόγος παρακλήσεως (Heb. xiii. 22).

Harnack, who had previously[1] considered it probable that Barnabas was the author, has recently[2] in a forcible and brilliant manner urged the claims of Prisca and Aquila. In their favour are such points as these: that the letter proceeds from a highly cultured teacher, answering to the description given in Acts xviii. 26 of Aquila and Prisca; that it was written by one who belonged to the Pauline circle, as there is no doubt that this couple did (Rom. xvi. 3 συνεργοί); that the writer was associated with Timothy, as Aquila and Prisca were for eighteen months in Corinth as well as in Ephesus (*cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 19); that he belonged to one of the house-churches in Rome (to which presumably the Epistle was addressed) and that he had taught there—which corresponds with what we know of Aquila and Prisca (see Acts xviii. 2, Rom. xvi. 3); that behind the writer of the Epistle there is some one or more with whom he associates himself in a common "we," for in the letter there are not merely the literary "we" and the "we" which includes writer and readers, but a third use of the pronoun embracing some unnamed person or persons as uniting with the writer in what he says. "If on the ground of these arguments it be considered probable that the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be referred to this couple, it may then be asked whether Prisca or Aquila wrote it. And if the predominant position of the woman, witnessed by both Paul and Luke, be considered, as well as the incontestable fact that she was foremost in winning Apollos, the balance must incline in favour of her authorship." It is thus he accounts for the most paradoxical feature in the history of the Epistle, the loss of the author's name. This disappearance is at once accounted for, if Prisca was even partly the author, for Paul's prohibition of female teaching in the Church had taken deep root.

That there is in these arguments not merely ingenuity, but much that deserves consideration, will not be denied. Indeed, so careful and sound a scholar as Bleek almost convinced himself that Aquila was the author of the Epistle, and expresses surprise that his claims should not have been urged.[3] But there are grave difficulties in the

[1] *Chronologie*, p. 477-479.

[2] Preuschen's *Zeitschrift*, vol. i., 16-41.

[3] Hebräer-brief, i., 421, 422. Harnack's claim to originality [niemand an sie gedacht hat] is valid only so far as Prisca is concerned.

double, predominantly feminine authorship advocated by Harnack. A single authorship is unquestionably demanded by certain expressions in the Epistle, as τί ἔτι λέγω, xi. 32; ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν, xiii. 19; and the singulars in xiii. 22, 23. It is not possible to construe these singulars as referring to more than one writer: but it is quite possible to construe the plurals of the Epistle as referring to the single writer or to the writer uniting himself with his readers. And that this one writer should have been Prisca is certainly improbable, both on account of Paul's prohibition which so good a friend as Prisca would observe, and because the writer seems to have been one of the ἡγούμενοι, which Prisca could not have been. The impression made by the Epistle is that it proceeds from a masculine mind; and if the Epistle is due to either we should suppose Aquila was more likely to undertake such a task. The familiarity which existed between this couple and Apollos might be supposed to account for the Alexandrian colouring of the Epistle.

The name of Apollos was suggested by Luther[1] who apparently had either heard or read that this authorship had been advocated by others. It has received the suffrages of scholars so competent as Bleek, Tholuck, Hilgenfeld, Lünemann, Reuss, Pfleiderer, Alford, Farrar and Plumptre. In Acts xviii. 24 Apollos is described as an Alexandrian Jew, a learned man, mighty in the Scriptures, who had been instructed in the way of the Lord and who spoke and taught with accuracy the things concerning Jesus. Passing from Ephesus, where he first appears in Christian history, to Achaia "he helped them much who had believed through grace, and powerfully confuted the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ". Paul also testifies to his influence as a teacher and probably indicates that his special function was that of carrying to maturity those who had already received the truth. The words "Paul planted, Apollos watered" bear this interpretation, and agree with what is said in Acts of his peculiar work. Certainly all this remarkably corresponds with the characteristics of the writer to the Hebrews, who certainly was a Jew of the Alexandrian school, a man of marked ability and culture, whose special training fitted him to build up in the faith and to find in the Scriptures

[1] "Autor Epistolae ad Hebraeos, quisquis est, sive Paulus, sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo" (*Com. on Gen.*); and in his sermon on 1 Cor iii. 4 "the Ep. Heb. is certainly his" [Apollos']. In another sermon he says "Some suppose the Epistle to be Luke's, some refer it to Apollos" ["etliche meinen, sie sei S. Lucas, etliche S. Apollo"]. The most thorough presentation of the claim of Apollos is that by Plumptre in the first vol. of the *Expositor*.

proof that Jesus was the Christ. This, plainly, does not prove that Apollos was the author, but it lends plausibility to the hypothesis.

Destination. Here, again, however, we find the authorship implicated with the destination of the Epistle. The only places with which we know Apollos to have been connected are Ephesus, Corinth and Crete. The first named city was swarming with Jews and was also impregnated with Alexandrianism. Corinth resembled it in the former and possibly also in the latter characteristic, for the preaching of Apollos had certainly found in that city a very responsive hearing; and it is the only place in which we have any positive reason to believe that he resided for any length of time. But evidently he was a man who moved about (Tit. iii. 13); and it is not improbable that he may have visited Rome. Evidently, however, if we are to come any nearer to a determination of the authorship, we must first of all try to ascertain the destination of the letter.

We may put aside the idea that it was not addressed to any particular Church but was a homily written for all whom it might concern. This idea has been plausibly stated by Reuss. "The Epistle to the Hebrews," he says, "is not a letter properly so called written in view of a local necessity; and the few personal and circumstantial details added on the last page were certainly not the reasons which prompted the author to write. This book may have been already penned and actually concluded when occasion offered to make it useful to a particular circle of Christians and in reference to whom he may have added the 13th chapter. The 'Hebrews' whose name is inserted by the care of a later reader (also truly inspired) are not, as has been imagined, the members of some isolated community, as *e.g.*, the Church at Jerusalem; they are Jewish Christians in general, considered from a theoretical point of view." This view has been adopted by Lipsius and others, and at the first blush it may seem to have something to say for itself, for letters do not usually begin without giving the name of the writer and of his correspondents. But the idea that the entire document is a treatise written in the study without definite reference to any particular group of Christians, is contradicted not merely by the personal references of the 13th chapter, but by the occurrence throughout the Epistle of expressions which have no meaning if not so addressed. Indeed, no Epistle more exclusively concentrates itself upon a definite and actual condition, nor more definitely recognises that its readers have passed through and are passing through well-marked experiences.

The writer's references in v. 12; vi. 9; x. 32; xii. 4; could only have been made to a definite group of Christians.[1]

This consideration is sufficient to prove that the title πρὸς Ἑβραίους without further designation is too indefinite to have been affixed to his letter by the author himself. Weizsäcker, indeed, is extravagant when he brands the inscription as "the unhappy conjecture of a later time," but we may unhesitatingly adopt Robertson Smith's language, and say that it is "hardly more than a reflection of the impression produced on an early copyist". The suggestion of Prof. Nestle[2] that it may indicate that the Epistle was addressed to the συναγωγὴ Ἀἰβρέων or Ἑβρέων in Rome is interesting, but obviously if the writer of the Epistle had himself addressed it to a synagogue of Jewish Christians in Rome, he could not have written merely "to Hebrews," but must have more definitely identified them by some further designation. In short, we cannot from this address derive any assistance in determining the Church to which the Epistle was addressed.

But that the inscription is right in so far as it declares that the letter was destined for Hebrew Christians has generally, though not universally, been acknowledged. The scope of the Epistle presupposes a profound attachment to the Mosaic dispensation. Not only is the Old Testament the common ground from which material can be drawn and on which the discussion can proceed, but the argument is one which can scarcely be conceived as addressed to Gentiles. It may almost be said with Dr. Bruce: "If the readers were indeed Gentiles, they were Gentiles so completely disguised in Jewish ideas and wearing a mask with so pronounced Jewish features that the true nationality has been successfully hidden for nineteen centuries". Or more summarily we may say with Reuss: "For this writer there are no Gentiles". To Gentile ears some of the expressions used in the Epistle would be unintelligible, others would be offensive. To the former class belong such exhortations as, "Let us go forth unto Him without the camp"; to the latter, "Not of angels doth He take hold, but of the seed of Abraham He taketh hold".

In spite of this, however, many eminent critics in recent times have reached the persuasion that the letter was addressed not to Hebrew, but to Gentile Christians. Schürer, Weizsäcker, von Soden, Jülicher, McGiffert are of this opinion. They are chiefly influenced by the consideration that the list of rudimentary doctrines

[1] See Burggaller's criticism of Wrede's "Das literarische Rätsel des Hebräerbriefes" in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift* for 1908.

[2] *Expository Times* for June, 1899.

given in chap. vi. are such as would rather be taught to Gentile catechumens than to Jewish converts. No doubt the doctrines there mentioned would be taught to Gentiles, but surely the contrast between faith in God and faith in dead works is peculiarly appropriate to Jews; and it was also the Jew rather than the Gentile who required explanation regarding the relation of Christian baptism to other lustrations. Besides, it must not be overlooked that the doctrines here enumerated are the "rudiments of Christ," and therefore nothing specifically Jewish could be mentioned. They are that common ground or "foundation" which underlay the specially Christian teaching.

Difficulty has also been found in the phrase ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος (iii. 12). This expression, it is felt, is more appropriate to a relapse to idolatry than to Judaism. But the very point of the whole Epistle is that an abandonment of Christianity is an abandonment of God; that in it God has finally spoken and that to neglect this revelation is to neglect God. In using this particular phrase the writer has not in view the end to which unbelief may lead them, but the fact that unbelief is apostasy from the living God, whether the unbeliever be Jew or Gentile.

These difficulties then are not insuperable, although they are possibly too cavalierly treated by Westcott, who pronounces that "the argument of von Soden, who endeavours to show that the Epistle was written to Gentiles, cannot be regarded as more than an ingenious paradox by any one who regards the general teaching of the Epistle in connection with the forms of thought in the Apostolic age".

Where, then, were these Jewish Christians resident? The places most generally approved are Jerusalem, Antioch, Cæsarea, Rome. In favour of the Jewish metropolis there is not much to be urged. To no Church on earth would it be so inappropriate to say that they had received the Gospel at second-hand (ii. 3). Many of its members must have been in direct communication with the Lord. Neither could it with any truth be said of the Church of Jerusalem that she had not been instrumental in teaching others (v. 12). This Church was also a poor community which itself required rather than afforded aid: whereas the society addressed in the Epistle had been conspicuous for charity (vi. 10; x. 34). It also seems most unlikely that if the Church at Jerusalem was addressed, no allusion should be made to the Temple. Neither is it probable that any one, himself a member of the Church at Jerusalem, should prefer Greek to Aramaic as his medium of communication.

As Antioch was the scene of a considerable part of the labours of

Barnabas it naturally suggests itself as the destination in connection with his supposed authorship of the Epistle. The Hebrew Christians in that city must have been very much in his care, and certainly they required some such exposition as is given in the Epistle, of the relation of Judaism to Christianity. And some critics, even while dismissing the claims of Barnabas, are inclined to find in Antioch the group of Jewish Christians to which the Epistle was addressed. Thus Mr Rendall[1] sums up his inquiry in the following terms: "To one of these great Syrian cities, perhaps to Antioch itself, I conceive the Epistle to have been addressed; for there alone existed flourishing Christian Churches, founded by the earliest missionaries of the Gospel, animated with Jewish sympathies, full of interest in the Mosaic worship, and glorying in the name of Hebrews; who nevertheless spoke the Greek language, used the Greek version of the Scriptures and numbered amongst their members converts who had, like the author, combined the highest advantages of Greek culture with careful study of the Old Testament and especially of the sacrificial Law." But could a Church which had actually started the great mission of Paul and Barnabas and in which other teachers abounded be open to the rebuke of chap. v. 11 ff.?

Recently critical opinion has decidedly veered towards Rome as the only possible destination. First suggested by Wetstein it is now advocated by Alford, Holtzmann, Zahn and many others. The clause in the Epistle which inevitably suggests this destination is the greeting in xiii. 24, ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας "they of Italy (the Italians) salute you". This clause shows that the Epistle was either written from or to Italy. But it is difficult to believe that the words were intended to convey a greeting from Italians in their own country to the writer's correspondents. For if the writer was in Italy, he was in some particular locality, and this place he would more naturally have named instead of using the general term "Italy". Certainly the more natural and satisfactory interpretation of the words is that which supposes that the writer who himself is a member of the Church he addresses is surrounded by those who also recognise Italy as their home and who seek to send greetings to their friends in Rome.

Nor does anything in the Epistle contradict this idea. That there was a large Jewish element in the Roman Church appears both from Acts and Romans, and is not denied. It has sometimes been thought that Jewish Christians in Rome could not be expected

[1] *Epistle to Hebrews*, p. 69.

to take so much interest in the Temple-worship or be so concerned about its observance as this Epistle requires; but, as Principal Fairbairn long ago pointed out, colonists idealise the institutions of their mother-country more than its resident population, and it is an idealised, not an actual worship that is here described. It is also to be considered that it was in Rome both in the time of Paul and in the second century that in many subtle ways Judaism sought to assert itself and to absorb or expunge Christianity. The fact too that it is in Rome we find the first traces of the use of the Epistle (by Clement) has some weight.

Zahn still further narrows the destination and identifies the recipients of the letter as a small circle of Christians in a large city, a house-church alongside of which there was another or several other such churches in the same city. They have an assembly of their own (x. 25), perhaps also rulers of their own (xiii. 17), although the rulers of the whole Church of the city are also their rulers, and therefore greetings are sent to *all* the rulers and to *all* the Saints (xiii. 24). He is not aware of any place which so well answers to these requirements as one of the house-churches in Rome mentioned in the Epistle of Paul to that Church (chap. xvi). To one of these, possibly to that mentioned in Romans xvi. 14, this Epistle was probably addressed.

The Roman destination may seem to carry with it the authorship of Aquila, for this Jew who was himself so well instructed that he was able to instruct Apollos was intimately associated with Rome and with one of the house-churches there (Romans xvi. 3-5). And indeed all that we know of Aquila seems to fit the conditions as well as any other name that has been suggested.

It is impossible then to dogmatise regarding the authorship of this Epistle, and at present it is best frankly to confess our ignorance. But we may adopt the language of Prof. Rhys Roberts in dealing with the similar case of *Longinus on the Sublime* and say that "while it is good science to refuse to hazard any conjecture which our information does not warrant, it is good science also to decline to follow some critics in abandoning all hope of ever seeing a solution of this knotty problem. Let us rather recognise that we are confronted with one of those stimulating and fruitful uncertainties which classical research so often presents to its votaries—uncertainties which are stimulating because there is some possibility of removing them, and fruitful because in any case they lead to the more thorough investigation of the obscurer bye-ways of history and literature." Or we may adopt the words of Dr. Davidson in dealing

with the similar problem of the authorship of the Book of Job: "There are some minds that cannot put up with uncertainty, and are under the necessity of deluding themselves into quietude by fixing on some known name. There are others to whom it is a comfort to think that in this omniscient age a few things still remain mysterious. Uncertainty is to them more suggestive than exact knowledge. No literature has so many great anonymous works as that of Israel. The religious life of this people was at certain periods very intense, and at these periods the spiritual energy of the nation expressed itself almost impersonally, through men who forgot themselves and were speedily forgotten in name by others." And if we cannot name, we can at least partially describe the author. For his letter reveals a man who was not an Apostle but a scholar of the Apostles; a man of the second Christian generation (genealogisch nicht chronologisch, as Harnack says); a Hellenist yet a member and teacher of a Jewish Christian church; a Paulinist with some tincture of Alexandrian culture, though his treatment of Scripture differs *toto coelo* from Philo's; a friend of Timothy and at the time of writing in the company of Italian Christians.

Aim. But it is not the locality so much as the condition of the readers that chiefly concerns us. And as we read the Epistle it becomes apparent that the danger which roused the writer to interpose was not such definite and grave heresy as evoked the Epistle to the Galatians or that to the Colossians, nor such entangling heathen vices and difficult questions of casuistry as imperilled the Corinthian Church, but rather a gradual, almost unconscious admission of doubt which dulled hope and slackened energy. They had professed Christianity for some time (v. 12); and the sincerity of their profession had been proved by the manner in which they had borne severe persecution (x. 33, 34). They had taken joyfully the spoiling of their possessions; they had endured a great conflict of sufferings. But they found the long-sustained conflict with sin (xli. 4) and the day-by-day contempt and derision they experienced as Christians (xiii. 13), more wearing to the spirit than sharper persecution. Consequently their knees had become feeble to pursue the path of righteous endurance and activity, their hands hung limply by their side as if they were defeated men (xii. 12). They had ceased to make progress and were in danger of falling away (vi. 1-4, iii. 12) and were allowing an evil heart of unbelief to grow in them. No doubt this listless, semi-believing condition laid them open to the incursion of "divers and strange teachings" (xiii. 9) and in itself was full of peril.

To restore in them the freshness of faith the writer at every

part of the Epistle exhorts them to steadfastness and perseverance. "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering" (xi. 23). "Cast not away your confidence" (x. 35). "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him" (x. 38). Or, what may be taken as the hortatory motto of the Epistle, "We are become partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end" (iii. 14). That they may have encouragement to do so, he shows them at large the good ground they have for confidence. The fruits of faith in their fathers are recapitulated in the eloquent eleventh chapter. But especially is Jesus exhibited as the great leader in faith. "Consider Him lest ye be weary and faint in your souls" (xii. 3). His supremacy and trustworthiness are expounded in detail, and especially the eternal sufficiency of His sacrifice and intercession is dwelt upon.

Evidently, then, the persons addressed were in the mental and spiritual condition common in every age of the Christian Church, a condition of languor and weariness, of disappointed expectations, deferred hopes, conscious failure and practical unbelief. They were Christians but had slender appreciation of the glory of their calling, misconstrued their experience, and had allowed themselves to drift away from boldness of hope and intensity of faith. Dr. Bruce describes them as persons who never had "insight into the essential nature and distinctive features of the Christian religion"; and if by "insight" he means such perception of the greatness of Christ as causes men to rejoice in serving and suffering for Him, his description is correct. But he seems less exact when he goes on to say "No greater mistake, I believe, can be committed (though it is a common fault of commentators) than to assume that the first readers were in the main in sympathy with the doctrinal views of the writer". Some points, no doubt, which the writer adduces were new to the readers. The manner in which the paragraph regarding Melchisedec is introduced proves this. But we cannot therefore conclude that the whole conception of Christ as Priest was new to them; nor can we suppose that they had never thought of Christ as the Son through whom the final revelation was made and the eternal covenant mediated. Rather they had failed *to consider what these great truths involved*. Hence the writer bids them give "the *more earnest* heed to the things they have heard" (ii. 1), and throughout the Epistle he returns to his favourite admonition "Consider Him," let your minds penetrate more deeply into His significance. They had ceased to have that keen interest in truth which prompts contemplation and inquiry, and they now held what

they had been taught so externally that they were in danger of wholly losing their faith and becoming practical apostates. They had fallen under the power of the present and visible, and were giving to appearance and shadow the value that belonged only to the eternal reality.

The aim of the writer then was to open up the true significance of Christ and His work, and thus to remove the scruples, hesitations and suspicions which haunted the mind of the Jewish Christian embarrassing his faith, lessening his enjoyment, and lowering his vitality. The Jew who accepted Jesus as the Christ had problems to solve and difficulties to overcome of which the Gentile knew nothing. A transition of equal moment and encompassed by so much obscurity men have rarely, if ever, been summoned to make. It is easy for those who look back upon it as an accomplished fact to see that there was no real breach of continuity between the old religion and the new; but that was not readily perceived by those whose whole life and experience were marked by the turmoil and instability which accompanied the abandonment of old forms, the acceptance of new ideas, the building on other foundations. Brought up in a religion which he was persuaded was of Divine authority the Jew was now required to consider a large part of his belief and worship as antiquated. Accustomed to pride himself on a history marked at various stages by angelic visits, Divine voices, and miraculous interventions, he is now invited to shift his faith from institutions and venerable customs to a Person, and this a Person in whom earthly glory is suggested only by its absence and in whom those *apparently* most qualified to judge could discover nothing but imposture which merited a malefactor's death. Cherishing with extraordinary enthusiasm, as his exclusive heritage, the Temple with all its hallowed associations, its indwelling God, its altar, its august priesthood, its complete array of ordinances, he is yet haunted by the Christian new-born instinct that there is an essential lacking in all these arrangements and that for him they are irrelevant and obsolete. A blight has suddenly fallen on what was brightest in his religion, a blight he can neither dissipate nor perfectly justify.

For the Jewish Christian must have found it quite beyond his power to understand the relation of the old to the new. Already indeed it had become apparent that in Jesus prophecy had been fulfilled. He had been accepted as the predicted Messiah partly because it was beyond dispute that in Him a correspondence was found to the figure more or less clearly defined in the Old Testament. This no doubt hinted that there was some strong and vital

connection between the two faiths. But what relation did this Messiah hold to the Mosaic institutions? That was a more difficult problem. The difficulty of it is appreciated when we consider that a large section of the Christian Church judged the old to be irreconcilable with the new, and went so far as to maintain that the God of the Old Testament was antagonistic to the God who revealed Himself in Christ. And even the more moderate section of the Church found difficulty in answering the questions: What was to be thought of the Jewish ordinances and of the Jewish Scriptures which enjoined them? If the ordinances were set aside, could the Scriptures which contained them be retained? In what sense had Christ fulfilled the law, the ceremonial? He had not been a Priest. He had not assumed the Priest's function, but the Rabbi's. He had not been born in a priestly family. A sacrifice, perhaps, in some sense, He had been.

To the Jew, in short, Christ must have created as many problems as He solved. The unquestioning faith that is guided by healthy instincts and can relegate to the future all intellectual explanations and reconcilements is not given to every one; and many a Jewish Christian must have passed those first days in painful unrest, drawn to trust Jesus by all that He knew of His holiness and truth and yet sorely perplexed and hindered from perfect trust by the unexpected spirituality of the new religion, by the contempt of his old co-religionists, by the enforced relinquishment of all outward garnishing and glory, and by the apparent impossibility of fitting the gorgeousness of the old and the bareness of the new into one consistent whole. To this miserable and weakening condition of spirit the writer appeals and aims at removing it by giving them a fuller insight into the relation of Christianity to Mosaism, and especially by illustrating the unique supremacy of Christ and the finality of His work. He makes it his aim to show that every name, every institution, every privilege, which had existed under the old economy survived in the new, but invested with a higher meaning and a truer glory—a meaning and a glory, new indeed in themselves, but yet for the first time fulfilling the great purpose of God which from the first had been dimly shadowed forth. "The first was taken away only in order that the second might be introduced."[1]

To this task he necessarily brought his own philosophical presuppositions. Trained in Alexandrian thought he cherished the Platonic[2] conception of the relation of the seen to the unseen. It

[1] Das Christenthum bringt nichts, was nicht schon im A. T. angelegt, verheissen und vorgebildet gewesen wäre" (Holtzmann, *N. T. Theol.*, ii., 287).

[2] *Timaeus*, 28 C.; *Rep.* 597; Philo, *Mundi Op.*, 4; *De Vita Mosis*, p. 146.

was his inalienable conviction that the visible world is merely phenomenal, the temporary form or manifestation of the invisible, archetypal world which alone is real and eternal. In the Epistle these two worlds are continually related by contrast. The unseen world [πράγματα οὐ βλεπόμενα xi. 1] is the eternal counterpart of this present order of things [αὕτη ἡ κτίσις ix. 11]; the reality, of which earthly things are but the shadow [σκία viii. 5]. The visible heaven and earth are one day to pass away, "as things that have been made" [ὡς πεποιημένων xii. 27], but this only in order that the eternal things which cannot be removed may remain alone existent.

On this broad philosophical basis, itself unshakable as the eternal things, the writer builds his argument. Here he finds the key to the essential distinction between Mosaism and Christianity, as well as the proof of the superiority and finality of the latter. The Mosaic dispensation belongs to the seen and temporal, the Christian to the unseen and eternal. In the one there is a tabernacle "made with hands"; a sanctuary of *this world*, equipped and furnished with material objects; the sacrifices are of bulls and goats; the rest appointed cannot be eternal, because it is in a visible earthly land; their holy city is one which can be profaned by Roman armies; above all, their priesthood is dependent on the flesh. How manifest that all these things belong to the earthly temporal order. The whole dispensation is involved with things visible, tangible, material, evanescent.

But Mosaism was not wholly useless. It was a shadow of the good things to come: and to these real, eternal things Christ introduces men. Christ Himself, being Son of God, belongs to the eternal order. In Him we have throughout to do not with external ceremonies and temporal arrangements, but with what is spiritual; in Him we come into touch not with imperfect revelations of God made through symbol and human medium, but with the very image of God. He mediates between God and man in virtue of His connection with both. He leads men into the true relation to God by Himself perfectly fulfilling the human life of obedience to God's will. His priesthood or power to carry His human brethren with Him into the heavenly life, springs out of His personal worth wrought by discipline to a perfected condition. He is priest in virtue not of what is of the flesh, not by inherited office, but by virtue of His sympathy with men and His personal stainlessness. He enters the presence of God not in an earthly tabernacle nor with the blood of bulls and goats but with His own blood, bringing men and God together by the pure and perfect surrender of Himself to God. This sacrifice though made on earth was yet made in the eternal order,

because made in spirit, in a spirit which necessarily belongs not to this visible and transitory order of things but to the eternal and real, or as the writer says, "through eternal spirit".

That which this writer finds common to the new and the old forms of religion is the purpose of God to bring men into fellowship with Himself, or, in other words, the covenant idea. With this writer religion is the harmony of God and man. He thinks of God, not like Paul, as a Judge before whose bar man must somehow be cleared of guilt, but as entering into covenant with man and providing for the maintenance of this covenant by sacrifice. In history he sees two great epochs in the promotion of this fellowship distinguished by the efficacy with which it is effected. For the covenant being between the holy, heavenly God and His unholy creature, it will not be quite easy to form or to maintain. It involves at any rate two things, that the will of God in the matter be made known, and that man be separated from his sin. It involves, that is to say, that the covenant be effectively mediated and especially in this respect that it be secured that man shall be cleansed from his sin and fitted for true and lasting fellowship with God. So essential is this, that each form of the covenant may be judged by the efficiency with which it accomplishes this. If the arrangements for bringing man into real and abiding union with God are imperfect, then this colours with imperfection the covenant to which these arrangements belong; if, on the other hand, such arrangements are made as actually cleanse the conscience and renew the character then this determines the perfectness of the covenant in which these arrangements are comprised.

Hence the importance which this writer attaches to priesthood and sacrifice. It is by these the nature and efficacy of every covenant between God and man must be determined. If one covenant only provides for a ceremonial purification and a symbolic introduction to God, this of itself stamps that covenant as inferior to one which provides for a spiritual cleansing and a real union If with one of the covenants there is identified a priesthood which is merely hereditary and therefore fleshly and professional, while the other rests on a natural and spiritual priesthood that offers a real spiritual sacrifice, the sacrifice of self, in contrast with the sacrifice of bulls and goats, there can be little hesitation in determining whether of these two is the eternal covenant. It is the writer's aim to exhibit this distinction. He knows that if only his readers can once see the real glory of Christ and His religion all their doubts will vanish, and accordingly he proceeds to send them

such an exposition of that glory as is in point of fact a magnificent apologetic for Christianity from the Jewish point of view.

The relation thus established between the former and the latter dispensation may tend to an undervaluing of the old, and lead to the idea that "the Jew was simply the keeper of a casket which he could not unlock, an actor in a symbolical representation which to him conveyed little or no meaning". It must be borne in mind, therefore, that the arrangements of the Old Testament were primarily for the religious use of the Jews themselves. Their religion was not devised for the intellectual employment or diversion of persons who can now look back upon it, nor altogether for the religious edification of such persons, but primarily for the religious edification of the Jews themselves. They needed a religion as much as we do. They needed assurance of God and His favour, and some means of access to Him and this they found in their religion of type and symbol. To them as to us a gospel was preached (iv. 2). Through the symbolic arrangements of their earthly tabernacle they learned real truth and were brought into fellowship with the eternal. Not that they understood what the physical arrangements of their religion *typified*, but that they did understand what they *symbolised*. The Old Testament ritual was instructive not in so far as it was typical, but in so far as it was symbolical. A symbol is an embodied idea, or what we nowadays call an "object lesson"; an idea rendered visible in a material sign or in an external action. A type not only expresses an idea, but looks forward to a time when this idea shall receive its perfect expression. As Mr. Litton[1] defines it "a type is a prophetic symbol". "Every true type is necessarily a symbol, that is, it embodies and represents the ideas which find their fulfilment in the antitype; but every symbol is not necessarily a type; a symbol may terminate in itself, and point to nothing future; it may even refer to something past." Now it cannot be supposed that the contemporaries of Moses or Moses himself understood what was prefigured by their ritual. But if they did not understand their ritual as a collection of types, they certainly did understand it as a system of symbols. The tabernacle itself was both a symbol and a type. It was a symbol that God dwelt with men, ever in their midst, sharing their fortunes, forgiving their sin, and bestowing blessing. This symbol every child could read. But it was also a type, a symbol with a prophecy wrapped up in it, a symbol giving promise that the truth taught in it would one day find its perfect, eternal manifestation. This could at the best be but imperfectly understood.

[1] Bampton Lectures, p. 82.

But the writer to the Hebrews looking back upon the preparation for Christ can see how this and that prefigured Him who was to come. Every Old Testament institution, ceremony, person or thing in which a principle or idea was embodied which was afterwards embodied in Christ and His Kingdom may legitimately be called "typical". To the Jews themselves these types were helpful not because they threw light upon the person and work of Christ, but because they then and there communicated those very ideas which were subsequently expressed in their reality in Jesus. The institution of sacrifice, *e.g.*, was useful to them not because it taught them to look for a Messiah who should die for their sins—for it had no such effect—but because it then and there communicated the very ideas and the very hopes which the death of Christ expressed—in a dim and unsatisfactory way no doubt, as this writer is careful to show, but still adequately as a first lesson in the holiness and forgiveness of God.

Keeping in view the aim of the writer to convince his readers that the new Christian order of things is an advance on the old Mosaic order, and is indeed the final and universal form of religion, the course of thought is easily followed. The Mediator of the new covenant is first of all compared with the Mediators of the old, with prophets, angels, Moses, Joshua, Aaron, and this comparison occupies the first seven chapters. The writer then proceeds to exhibit the evanescence of the old covenant and the superiority of the new (viii. 6-13), and of the true God-pitched tabernacle and its sacrifice to the first man-made tabernacle with its arrangements and offerings (ix. 1-x. 18). On this demonstrated superiority and finality of the covenant which Christ has mediated the writer founds a forcible appeal and exhorts his readers to hold fast their profession and to use the access to God provided for them (x. 19-25). This exhortation he enforces by warnings (x. 26-31), by awakening remembrances of better times (32-39), by the rapid, sugggestive and eloquent presentation of their predecessors in faith (xi.), and especially of Him whose example in faith and endurance is perfect (xii. 1-4), and by illustrating the reasonableness of hopefully submitting to present trouble as discipline sent by the heavenly Father (xii. 5-13). They are further urged to diligence in sanctification by the consideration that awful as were the sanctions of the old law, those of the new covenant are immensely more awful, that indeed our God is a consuming fire (xii. 14-29). The closing chapter contains miscellaneous but relevant admonitions.

Date. The chief index to the date of the Epistle is its relation

to the destruction of the Temple. The impression one receives from its perusal is that the sacrifices and other services of the Temple were still being performed. If particular passages are examined, this impression is deepened. It is quite true that the use of the present tense (as in Heb. ix. 6, viii. 4, etc.) does not always imply an actual present. The use of this tense by Clement (*Ep.* c. 41) in describing ordinances which in his day were certainly obsolete puts this beyond question. But of course the use of the present generally implies the existence of the object spoken of at the time of the speaker; and it is not easy to suppose that if the Temple and its worship had already been abolished, this writer could use such language as we find in c. x. 1, 2; "they can never with the same sacrifices year by year which they offer continually make perfect them that draw nigh. *Else would they not have ceased to be offered?*" And as Ménégoz[1] says: "C'est précisément l'existence du culte levitique qui offrait des dangers pour la fidelité des chretiens. Après la destruction du Temple ce danger avait disparu, du moins en majeure partie." Besides, it is impossible to suppose that a writer wishing to demonstrate the evanescent nature of the Levitical dispensation, and writing after the Temple services had been discontinued, should not have pointed to that event as strengthening his argument. It would appear, then, that the Epistle must have been written while the Temple was yet standing, that is, prior to the year A.D. 70.

Accordingly Salmon dates the Epistle in 63; Ménégoz places it in 64-67. The year 66 or thereabouts is adopted by Riehm, Lünemann, Hilgenfeld, Weiss, Beyschlag, Schürer, Godet, Westcott. Bleek prefers the year 68 or 69. Harnack, Pfleiderer, von Soden, Holtzmann and McGiffert bring it down to some date between A.D. 81 and 96.

Commentaries. Full lists of commentaries on the Epistle are easily accessible in Bible Dictionaries or in Delitzsch's Commentary. A selection is given by von Soden in the *Hand-commentar.* Here it must suffice to name the most outstanding. Among the patristic commentators Chrysostom is unquestionably the most valuable, always sensible and well expressed. Of mediæval writers Primasius, Atto Vercellensis and Herveius may be consulted with advantage.[2] Calvin, Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Bengel will inevitably be used in the study of this Epistle, as of any part of the New

[1] *La Theol. de l'ep.* etc., p. 40.

[2] On these and others see Riggenbach's *Die ältesten lateinischen Komm: Zum Hebräerbrief* in Zahn's *Forschungen.*

Testament. At the foundation of all more recent elucidation of the Epistle lies Bleek's great work, *Der Brief an die Hebräer erläutert* (1828-1840), the most comprehensive and scholarly, and in all respects one of the best commentaries on any book of the New Testament. Of almost equal value is Weiss' contribution to the revised Meyer. Delitzsch though not so exact is generally suggestive and always rich in material, while his knowledge of the Old Testament enables him to enter into the author's point of view. Westcott, largely indebted to Bleek, is, as always, full and accurate. Vaughan is of great use for ascertaining the precise meaning and biblical usage of words. Davidson (Clark's Bible-class Hand-books) penetrates to the meaning of the writer better than any other commentator. Peake (Jack's *Century Bible*) rivals him in this and has a rare gift of compact lucidity. No better book could be conceived or is needed for English readers. Nothing better has been written on the Epistle than his chapter on its teaching.

Other works such as those by Owen, Peirce, Moses Stuart, Tholuck, Hofmann, McCaul, Lowrie and von Soden will be found helpful, and each has a merit of its own. And naturally the great collectors of illustrative material, Wetstein and Schoettgen, Kypke, Elsner and Raphel will be used. The parallels from Philo have been carefully collected by Carpzov. Where Anz is named, the reference is to his *Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina repetita* in the Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses, vol. xii., part ii. (1884).

Riehm's *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes* is a classic, a monument of German industry and comprehensiveness, full of detail but never wearisome, always lighting up old meanings with fresh flashes of insight. Bruce's presentation of the substance of the Epistle (*The Ep. to the Hebrews*, Clark) is characteristically vigorous and full of elevated thought and enriching ideas. An excellent book on *The Theology of the Epistle* has also been issued by Dr. George Milligan. And quite indispensable to the student is *La Theologie de l'Epitre aux Hebreux*, by Eugène Ménégoz.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT.

I. Greek Uncials.

ℵ Sinaiticus Petropolitanus, Saec. iv. Complete.

A Alexandrinus Londinensis, Saec. v. Complete.

B Vaticanus Romanus, Saec. iv. Defective from ix. 14—end. ["Manus multo recentior supplevit, Heb. ix. 14-xiii. 25, quae Mico Italus ipsius codicis conlator Bentleio jubente contulit et Tischendorfius aliquoties notavit siglo b." Gregory's *Prolegomena*, p. 418.]

C Ephraemi Parisiensis, Saec. v. Wants i. 1 πολυμερως—πνευματος αγιου ii. 4. vii. 26 αμιαντος—μεσιτης ix. 15. x. 24 πης και καλων—μιανθωσιν πολλοι xii. 15.

D Claromontanus Parisiensis Nationalis 107, Graeco-Latinus. ["Latina inprimis in epistula ad Hebraeos errores multos praebent" Gregory.] Saec. vi. Heb. xiii. 21-23 is lost. Beza, to whom we owe the earliest notice of this Codex describes it as of equal antiquity with his copy (D) of the Gospels, and tells us it was found at Clermont, near Beauvais. Many hands have revised it.

E Petropolitanus, Graeco-Latinus, Saec. ix. Wants Heb. xii. 8 παντες—υμων, xiii. 25. A faulty copy of D after it had been more than once corrected.

Fa Coislinianus Parisiensis, Saec. vii. Contains x. 26.

H Coislinianus Parisiensis nationalis 202, Saec. vi. The leaves of this MS. are still scattered, some at Paris, some at Moscow, some at St. Petersburg, some at Mt. Athos, others elsewhere. It contains of Hebrews, chapters ii., iii., iv., x.

K Moscuensis, Saec. ix. Complete.

L Angelicus Romanus, Saec. ix. Complete to xiii. 10 εξουσιαν.

M Londin, Hamburg (Scrivener's *Codex Ruber*, so called from beautifully bright red colour of the ink), Saec. ix. Contains i. 1-iv. 3, and xii. 20-xiii. 25. "Textu ad optimos testes hic codex accedit." Gregory, *cf.* Scrivener, p. 184-85.

N Petropolitanus, Saec. ix. Contains v. 8-vi. 10.

O Fragmenta Mosquensia, Saec vi. (?) Contains x. 1-3, 3-7, 32-34, 35-38. Scrivener.

P Porfirianus Chiovensis, Saec. ix. Complete. xii. 9, 10 illegible.

The first verse of the Epistle has been edited by Messrs. Grenfell & Hunt from a fragment in Lord Amherst's collection of papyri. It is in a small uncial hand of the early fourth century. It reads ἡμῶν after πατράσιν.

II. Greek Cursives.

Of the large number of cursives cited by Tischendorf, it may suffice to mention the Codex Colbertinus of the Imperial Library of Paris, collated by Tregelles, and cited as 17 [33 of the Gospels]. It belongs to the eleventh century, and is of great value. Another MS. which was collated by Tregelles and highly valued by him is the Codex Leicestrensis of the fourteenth century, and cited under the sign 37. Gregory also marks 47, Oxon. Bodl. Roe, as "bonae notae". It also was collated by Tregelles.

III. Versions.

The Old Latin and the Vulgate, the Peshitto and Harklean Syriac, the Coptic and fragments of the Sahidic and Bashmuric versions, together with the Armenian and Æthiopic are available for the ascertainment of the text of the Epistle. [For remarks on these versions, see Westcott's *Com.*, Introduction.]

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.[1]

I. 1. [a] ΠΟΛΥΜΕΡΩΣ καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων[2] τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλά- a Num. xii. 6, 8; Eph. i. 10; Gal. iv. 4.

[1] The title should be simply ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ. See Introd.

[2] T.R. with 47, and some versions; εσχατου with ℵABDEKLMP, 17, etc.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1-3. The aim of the writer is to prove that the old Covenant through which God had dealt with the Hebrews is superseded by the New; and this aim he accomplishes in the first place by exhibiting the superiority of the mediator of the new Covenant to all previous mediators. The Epistle holds in literature the place which the Transfiguration holds in the life of Christ. Former mediators give place and Christ is left alone under the voice "Hear ye Him". With this writer, Jesus is before all else the Mediator of a better Covenant, viii. 6. But 'Mediator' involves the arranging and accomplishing of everything required for the efficacy of the Covenant; the perfect knowledge of the person and purposes of Him who makes the Covenant with men and the communication of this knowledge to them; together with the removal of all obstacles to man's entrance into the fellowship with God implied by the Covenant. This twofold function is in these first three verses shown to be discharged by Christ. He as Son speaks to men for God and thus supersedes all previous revelations; while, instead of appointing a priest who can only picture a cleansing, and accomplish a ceremonial purity, He becomes Priest and actually cleanses men from sin, and so effects their actual fellowship with God.

Ver. 1. In sonorous and dignified terms the writer abruptly makes his first great affirmation: "God having spoken . . . spoke". **ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας . . . ἐλάλησεν**, for, however contrasted, previous revelations proceeded from the same source and are one in design and in general character with that which is final. In the N.T. **λαλεῖν** is not used in a disparaging sense, but, especially in this Epistle, is used of God making known His will. See ii. 2, iii. 5, v. 5, etc. God spoke, desired to be understood, to come into communication with men and therefore uttered Himself in intelligible forms, and succeeded, all through the past, in making Himself and His will known to men. He had not kept silence, allowing men to feel after Him if haply they might find Him. He had met the outstretched hand and guided the seeker. And this "speaking" in the past was preparatory to the final speaking in Christ; "God having spoken . . . spoke". The earlier revelations were the preparation for the later but were distinguished from it in four particulars—in the time, in the recipients, in the agents, in the manner.

πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως "in many parts and in many ways". The alliteration is characteristic of the author, *cf.* v. 8, v. 14, vii. 3, ix. 10, etc. For the use of the words in Greek authors see Wetstein. **πολυμερῶς** points to the fragmentary character of former revelations. They were given piece-meal, bit by bit, part by part, as the people needed and were able to receive them. The revelation of God was essentially progressive; all was not disclosed at once, because all could not at once be

understood. One aspect of God's nature, one element in His purposes, reflected from the conditions of their time, the prophets could know; but in the nature of things it was impossible they should know the whole. They were like men listening to a clock striking, always getting nearer the truth but obliged to wait till the whole was heard. Man can only know in part, **ἐκ μέρους**, 1 Cor. xiii. [A fine illustration will be found in Browning's *Cleon*, in lines beginning: "those divine men of old time have reached, thou sayest well, each *at one point* the outside verge," etc..] The "speaking" of God to the fathers was conditioned by the capacity of the prophets. His speaking was also **πολυτρόπως** [*cf. Odyss.* i. 1. **Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον**] not in one stereotyped manner but in modes varying with the message, the messenger, and those to whom the word is sent. Sometimes, therefore, God spoke by an institution, sometimes by parable, sometimes in a psalm, sometimes in an act of righteous indignation. For, as Peake says, "the author is speaking not of the forms in which God spoke *to* the prophets, but of the modes in which He spoke *through* them to the fathers. The message took the form of law or prophecy, of history or psalm; now it was given in signs, now in types." So Hofmann. These features of previous revelations, so prominently set and expressed so grandiloquently, cannot have been meant to disparage them, rather to bring into view their affluence and pliability and many-sided application to the growing receptivity and varying needs of men. He wins his readers by suggesting the grandeur of past revelations. But it is at the same time true, as Calvin remarks, "varietatem fuisse imperfectionis notam". So Bengel, "Ipsa prophetarum multitudo indicat, eos ex parte prophetasse". These characteristics, while they encouragingly disclosed God's purpose to find His way to men, did yet discredit, as inadequate for perfect achievement, each method that was tried. The contrast in the new revelation is implied in the word **ἐκάθισεν**, indicating that the work was once for all accomplished.

The next note of previous revelations is found in **πάλαι** "of old," not merely "in time past" as A.V.; marking the time referred to in **λαλήσας** as contrasted with the writer's present, and gently suggesting that other methods of speaking might now be appropriate. Already in 2 Cor. iii. 14 the Mosaic covenant is spoken of as **ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη** *cf.* viii. 13. Here **πάλαι** is contrasted with **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων**, "at the last of these days," ["Aufs Ende dieser Tage," Weizsäcker], *i.e.*, in the Messianic time at the close of the period known to the Jews as "this present time or age". The expression is used in the LXX indifferently with **ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τ. ἡμερῶν** or **ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις** to translate בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים (see Isa. ii. 2; Gen. xlix. 1; Num. xxiv. 14), which was used to denote either the future indefinitely or the Messianic period, "the latter days" in which all prophecy was to find its fulfilment. Bleek quotes Kimchi as saying: "Ubicunque leguntur 'Beaharith Hayamim' ibi sermo est de diebus Messiae". And Wetstein quotes R. Nachman: "*Extremum dierum* consensu omnium doctorum sunt Dies Messiae". It was this Jewish usage which the N.T. writers followed in speaking of their own times as "the last days;" **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τ. χρόνου** (Jude 18); **ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τ. ἡμερῶν** (2 Pet. iii. 3); **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τ. χρόνων** (1 Pet. i. 20); and in this Epistle, ix. 26, Christ is said to have appeared **ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων**. The first Advent as terminating the old world and introducing the Messianic reign was considered the consummation. The introduction of the word **τούτων** is suggested by the Jewish division of the world's course into two periods: "This Age" (Ha-Olam Hazzeh) and The Coming Age (Ha-Olam Habbah). The end of "this age" or "these days" was signalised by the coming of the Messiah, the new revelation in Christ. More effectually than the Jews themselves expected has the Advent of the Messiah antiquated the old world and opened a new period.

The temporal contrast is further marked by the words **τοῖς πατράσιν** (ver. 1) and **ἡμῖν** (ver. 2). Former revelations had been made to "the fathers," *i.e.*, of the Jewish people, as in John vii. 22; Rom. ix. 5, xv. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 4. More frequently "our" "your" "their" is added, as in Acts iii. 13, 25; Luke vi. 53. But it is idle to urge, with von Soden, the absence of the pronoun as weighing against the restriction of the term in this place to the Jewish fathers. **ἡμῖν** "to us" of these last days, of the Christian dispensation.

The determining contrast between the

λησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, 2. [b] ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν,[1] 3. [c] ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ

b Ps. ii. 8; Matt. xxi. 38; Joan. i. 3; Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 16.

c viii. 1 et ix. 12, etc., et xii. 2; Ps. cx. 1; Sap. vii. 26; Joan. i. 4, et xiv. 9; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15, 7; Phil. ii. 6; Apoc. iv. 11.

[1] T.R. in DᵇKLP with other MSS. and versions; **και εποιησεν τ. αιωνας** in ℵABD*, etc., E, etc.

two revelations is found in this, that in the one God spoke **ἐν τοῖς προφήταις**, while in the other He spoke **ἐν υἱῷ**. "The prophets" stand here, not for the prophetic writings as in Jo. vi. 45; Acts xiii. 40, etc.; but for all those who had spoken for God, and especially for that great series of men from Abraham and Moses onwards who had been the organs of revelation and were identified with it (*cf.* the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen). The prep. **ἐν** is not used in its instrumental sense (*cf.* Habak. ii. 1), nor is it = **διὰ**, it brings God closer to the hearers of the prophetic word, and implies that what the prophets spoke, God spoke. So Hofmann and Weiss. ["Ipse in cordibus eorum dixit quicquid illi foras vel dictis vel factis locuti sunt hominibus," Herveius.] The full significance of **ἐν** is seen in **ἐν υἱῷ**. **ἐν υἱῷ** without the article must be translated "in a son" or "in one who is a son," indicating the nature of the person through whom this final revelation was made. The revelation now consisted not merely in what was said [**προφήταις**] but in what He was [**υἱός**]. This revelation was final because made by one who in all He is and does, reveals the Father. By uttering Himself He expresses God. A Son who can be characteristically designated a son, carries in Himself the Father's nature and does not need to be instructed in purposes which are also and already His own, nor to be officially commissioned and empowered to do what He cannot help doing. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him" (*cf.* John i. 18). The whole section on "The Son of God" in Dalman's *Die Worte Jesu* should be read in this connection. "Son" is here used in its Messianic reference, as the quotations cited in vv. 5, 6 prove. The attributes ascribed to the Son are at the same time Divine attributes. [So Baur and Pfleiderer. Ménégoz denies this]. The writer apparently experiences no difficulty in attaching to one and the same personality the creating of the world and the dying to cleanse sin.

The Son is described in six particulars which illustrate His supremacy and His fitness to reveal the Father: (1) His destination to universal lordship (**ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων**); (2) His agency in creation (**δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν τ. αἰῶνας**); (3) His likeness to God (**ὢν ἀπαύγασμα κ.τ.λ.**); (4) His relation to the world) **φέρων τὰ πάντα**); (5) His redemptive work (**καθαρισμὸν . . . ποιησάμενος**); (6) His exaltation (**ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ κ.τ.λ.**). *Cf.* Vaughan. **ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων** "whom He appointed heir of all". Davidson, Weiss and others understand this of the actual elevation of Christ, on His ascension, to the Lordship of all. ["Dass der Verfasser bei diesen Worten an den erhöhten Christus gedacht habe, halten wir für unzweifelhaft," Riehm, p. 295]. But the position of the clause in the verse and the subsequent mention of the exaltation in ver. 3 rather indicate that **ἔθηκεν** has here its ordinary meaning (see Elsner and Bleek) of "appointed," and that the reference is to Ps. ii. 8 **δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου κ.τ.λ.**, so Hofmann. Through this Son God is to accomplish His purpose. The Son is to reign over all. The writer lifts the thought of the despondent to Christ's triumph and Lordship. In the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen Christ speaks of Himself as Heir. It is involved in the Sonship; Gal. iv. 7. It is not simply possessor but possessor because of a relation to the Supreme. The Father could not be called **κληρονόμος**. Dalman shows that the 2nd Psalm "deduces from the filial relation of the King of Zion to God, that universal dominion, originally proper to God, is bequeathed to the Son as an inheritance," *Worte Jesu*, p. 220, E. Tr. 268. *Cf.* also Matt. xi. 27, **πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου**. [Chrysostom says the use of the term brings out two points **τὸ τῆς υἱότητος γνήσιον, καὶ τὸ τῆς κυριότητος ἀναπόσπαστον.**] The inheritance is not fully entered upon, until it can be said

τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, δι' ἑαυτοῦ [1] καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν,[2]

[1] T.R. in DᶜEKLM al pler, d, e, Syrʳᵘᵗʳ; omit δι εαυτου with ℵABDᵇP, 17, 46*, 47.

[2] Omit ημων with ℵ*ABD*E*MP.

that "the kingdom of the world is become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ," Rev. xi. 15. *Cf.* Heb. ii. 8. But by His incarnation He came into touch with men and poured His life into human history, at once claiming and securing His great inheritance.

δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας "through whom also He made the world," "per quem fecit et secula" (Vulg.), "durch Welchen er auch die Weltzeiten gemacht hat" (Weizsäcker). "Secula et omnia in iis decurrentia" (Bengel). Weiss thinks it quite improbable that so pure a Greek writer should use **αἰῶνας** in the rabbinical sense as = "world," and he believes that the Greek interpreters are right in retaining the meaning "world-periods". But in xi. 3 it becomes obvious that this writer could use the word as virtually = **κόσμος**. "The thought of duration is never wholly lost in the Scripture use of **αἰών**, though in this place, and in xi. 3 it is all but effaced" (Vaughan). *Cf.* Schoettgen and McCaul. The writer perhaps has it in his mind that the significant element in creation is not the mass or magnificence of the material spheres but the evolution of God's purposes through the ages. The mind staggers in endeavouring to grasp the vastness of the physical universe but much more overwhelming is the thought of those times and ages and aeons through which the purpose of God is gradually unfolding, unhasting and unresting, in the boundless life He has called into being. He who is the end and aim, the heir, of all things is also their creator. The **καὶ** brings out the propriety of committing all things to the hand that brought them into being. The revealer is the creator, Jo. i. 1-5. He only can guide the universe to its fit end who at first, presumably with wisdom equal to His power, brought it into being. ["Cette idée d'un être céleste chargé de réaliser la pensée créatrice de Dieu est une idée philonienne; elle a pénétré dans le Judaisme sous l'influence de la philosophie grecque" (Ménégoz). It is true that this is a Philonic idea (see numerous passages in Carpzov, Bleek, McCaul and Drummond) but we may also say with Weiss "Die philonischen Aussagen . . . gehören gar nicht hierher". Certainly Philo never claimed for a definite historical person the attributes here enumerated.] For the Son's agency in Creation see John i. 2; Col. i. 15. Grotius' rendering "propter Messiam conditum esse mundum" is interesting as illustrating his standpoint, but would require **δι' ὅν.**

Ver. 3. **ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα. . . .** "Who being effulgence of His glory and express image of His nature." The relative **ὃς** finds its antecedent in **υἱῷ**, its verb in **ἐκάθισεν**; and the interposed participles prepare for the statement of the main verb by disclosing the fitness of Christ to be the revealer of God, and to make atonement. The two clauses, **ὢν . . . φέρων τε,** are closely bound together and seem intended to convey the impression that during Christ's redemptive activity on earth there was no kenosis, but that these Divine attributes lent efficacy to His whole work. [On the difficulty of this conception see Gore's *Bampton Lec.*, p. 266, and Carpenter's *Essex Hall Lec.*, p. 87.] **ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης . . . ἀπαύγασμα** may mean either what is flashed forth, or what is flashed back: either "ray" or "reflection". Calvin, Beza, Thayer, Ménégoz prefer the latter meaning. Thus Grotius has, "repercussus divinae majestatis, qualis est solis in nube". The Greek fathers, on the other hand, uniformly adopt the meaning "effulgence". Thus Theodoret **τὸ γὰρ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός ἐστι, καὶ σὺν τῷ πυρί ἐστι· καὶ αἴτιον μὲν ἔχει τὸ πῦρ, ἀχώριστον δέ ἐστι τοῦ πυρός . . . καὶ τῷ πυρὶ δὲ ὁμοφυὲς τὸ ἀπαύγασμα: οὐκοῦν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί.** So in the Nicene Creed **φῶς ἐκ φωτός.** "The word 'efflulgence' seems to mean not rays of light streaming from a body in their connection with that body or as part of it, still less the reflection of these rays caused by their falling upon another body, but rather rays of light coming out from the original body and forming a similar light-body themselves" (Davidson). So Weiss, who says that the "Strahlenglanz ein zweites Wesen erzeugt". Philo's use of the word lends colour to this meaning when

he says of the human soul breathed into man by God that it was **ἄτε τῆς μακαρίας καὶ τρισμακαρίας φύσεως ἀπαύγασμα.** So in India, Chaitanya taught that the human soul was like a ray from the Divine Being; God like a blazing fire and the souls like sparks that spring out of it. In the Arian controversy this designation of the Son was appealed to as proving that He is eternally generated and exists not by an act of the Father's will but essentially. See Suicer, s.v. As the sun cannot exist or a lamp burn without radiating light, so God is essentially Father and Son. **τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.** God's glory is all that belongs to him as God, and the Son is the effulgence of God's glory, not only a single ray but as Origen says: **ὅλης τῆς δόξης.** Therefore the Son cannot but reveal the Father. Calvin says: "Dum igitur audis filium esse splendorem Paternae gloriae, sic apud te cogita, gloriam Patris esse invisibilem, donec in Christo refulgeat". As completing the thought of these words and bringing out still more emphatically the fitness of the Son to reveal, it is added **καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. χαρακτήρ,** as its form indicates, originally meant the cutting agent [**χαράσσειν**], the tool or person who engraved. In common use, however, it usurped the place of **χάραγμα** and denoted the impress or mark made by the graving tool, especially the mark upon a coin which determined its value; hence, any distinguishing mark, identifying a thing or person, *character*. "Express image" translates it well. The mark left on wax or metal is the "express image" of the seal or stamp. It is a reproduction of each characteristic feature of the original. **ὑποστάσεως** rendered "person" in A.V.; "substance," the strict etymological equivalent, in R.V. To the English ear, perhaps, "nature" or "essence" better conveys the meaning. It has not the strict meaning it afterwards acquired in Christian theology, but denotes all that from which the glory springs and with which indeed it is identical. [We must not confound the **δόξα** with the **ἀπαύγασμα** as Hofmann and others do. The **ὑπόστασις** is the nature, the **δόξα** its quality, the **ἀπαύγασμα** its manifestation.] There is in the Father nothing which is not reproduced in the Son, save the relation of Father to Son. Ménégoz objects that though a mirror perfectly reflects the object before it and the wax bears the very image of the seal, the mirror and the wax have not the same nature as that which they represent. And Philo more than once speaks of man's rational nature as **τύπος τις καὶ χαρακτὴρ θείας δυνάμεως,** and the **ἀπαύγασμα** of that blessed nature, see *Quod deter. insid.*, c. xxiii.; *De Opif. Mundi*, c. li. All that he means by this is, that man is made in God's image. But while no doubt the primary significance of the terms used by the writer to the Hebrews is to affirm the fitness of Christ to reveal God, the accompanying expressions, in which Divine attributes are ascribed to Him, prove that this fitness to reveal was based upon community of nature. The two clauses, **ὃς** to **αὐτοῦ,** have frequently been accepted as exhibiting the Trinitarian *versus* the Arian and Sabellian positions; the Sabellians accepting the **ἀπαύγασμα** as representing their view of the modal manifestation of Godhead, the Arians finding it possible to accept the second clause, but neither party willing to accept both clauses—separate or individual existence of the Son being found in the figure of the seal, while identity of nature seemed to be affirmed in **ἀπαύγασμα.** [**ὑπόστασις** was derived from the Stoics who used it as the equivalent of **οὐσία,** that which formed the essential substratum, **τὸ ὑποκείμενον,** of all qualities. The Greek fathers, however, understood by it what they termed **πρόσωπον ὁμοούσιον** and affirmed that there were in the Godhead three **ὑποστάσεις.** The Latin fathers translating **ὑπόστασις** by *substantia* could not make this affirmation. Hence arose confusion until Gregory Nazianzen pointed out that the difference was one of words not of ideas, and that it was due to the poverty of the Latin language. See Suicer, s.v.; Bleek in *loc.*; Bigg's *Christian Platonists*, p. 164-5; Dean Strong's *Articles* in *J.T.S.* for 1901 on the History of the Theological term Substance; Calvin *Inst.*, i., 13, 2; Loofs' *Leitfaden*, p. 109 note and p. 134.]

φέρων τε τὰ πάντα . . . "and upholding all things by the word of His power". The meaning of **φέρων** is seen in such expressions as that of Moses in Num. xi. 14 **οὐ δυνήσομαι ἐγὼ μόνος φέρειν πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον,** where the idea of being responsible for their government and guidance is involved. So in Plutarch's *Lucullus*, 6, **φέρειν τὴν πόλιν** of governing the city. In Latin Cicero (*pro Flac.*, 37) reminds his judges "sustinetis rempublicam humeris vestris". See Bleek. In Rabbinic literature, as

[d] Eph. i. 21; Phil. ii. 9, 10. ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, 4. [d] τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρο-

Schoettgen shows, God is commonly spoken of as "portans mundum," the Hebrew word being סָבַל In Philo, the Logos is the helmsman and pilot of all things (*De Cherub.*) **τῷ ῥήματι**, by the expression of His power, by making His will felt in all created nature. The present, **φέρων**, seems necessarily to involve that during the whole of His earthly career, this function of upholding nature was being discharged. Probably the clause is inserted not merely to illustrate the dignity of the Son, but to suggest that the whole course of nature and history, when rightly interpreted, reveals the Son and therefore the Father. The responsibility of bringing the world to a praiseworthy issue depends upon Christ, and as contributing to this work His earthly ministry was undertaken. For the notable thing He accomplished as God's Son, the use He made of His dignity and power, is expressed in the words, **καθαρισμὸν τ. ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος** "having accomplished purification of the sins". This was as essential to the formation of the covenant as the ability rightly to represent God's mind and will. This itself was the supreme revelation of God, and it was only after accomplishing this He could sit down at God's right hand as one who had finished the work of mediating the eternal covenant. **ποιησάμενος**, the mid. voice, supersedes the necessity of **δι' ἑαυτοῦ**. The aorist part. implies that the cleansing referred to was a single definite act performed before He sat down, and in some way preparatory to that Exaltation. The word receives explanation in subsequent passages of the Ep. vii. 27, ix. 12-14. **καθαρισμός** as used in LXX suggests that the cleansing referred to means the removal of guilt and its consciousness. The worshippers were fitted by cleansing to appear before God.

ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ . . . "sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high". **ἐκάθισεν** seems to denote that the work undertaken by the Son was satisfactorily accomplished; while the sitting down **ἐν δεξιᾷ κ.τ.λ.** denotes entrance upon a reign. The source of the expression is in Ps. cx. 1 (cited v. 13) where the Lord says to Messiah **κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου**, and this not only as introducing Him to the place of security and favour, but also of dignity and power. "The King's right hand was the place of power and dignity, belonging to the minister of his authority and his justice, and the channel of his mercy, the Mediator in short between him and his people" (Rendall). *Cf.* Ps. lxxx. 17. In contrast to the ever-growing and never complete revelation to the fathers, which kept the race always waiting for something more sufficing, there came at last that revelation which contained all and achieved all. But the expression not only looks backward in approval of the work done by the Son, but forward to the result of this work in His supremacy over all human affairs. **μεγαλωσύνη** is ascribed to God in Jude 25 and in Deut. xxxii. 3 **δότε μεγαλωσύνην τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν**. *Cf.* also Clem., *Ep.*, xvi. Here it is used to denote the sovereign majesty inherent in God (*cf.* xii. 2; Mk. xiv. 62). The words **ἐν ὑψήλοις** are connected by Westcott and Vaughan with **ἐκάθισεν**. It is better, with Beza and Bleek, to connect them with **μεγαλωσύνης**, for while in x. 12 and xii. 2, where it is said He sat down on the throne *of God*, no further designation is needed; in viii. 1, as here, where it is said that He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty, it is felt that some further designation is needed and **ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς** is added. No local region is intended, but supreme spiritual influence, mediation between God, the ultimate love, wisdom and sovereignty, and this world. This writer and his contemporary fellow-Christians, had reached the conviction here expressed, partly from Christ's words and partly from their own experience of His power.

Vv. 4—ii. 18. *The Son and the Angels.* Ver. 4, although forming part of the sentence 1-3, introduces a subject which continues to be more or less in view throughout chaps. i. and ii. The exaltation of the Mediator to the right hand of Sovereignty is in keeping with His designation as Son, a designation which marked Him out as superior to the angels. Proof is adduced from the O.T. To this proof, in accordance with the writer's manner, a resulting admonition is attached, ii. 1-4. And the remainder of chap. ii. is occupied with an explanation of the reasonableness of the

νόμηκεν ὄνομα. 5. Τίνι γὰρ εἶπέ ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων, Υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε; καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ e v. 5; 2 Sam. vii. 14; 1 Par. xxii. 10 et xxviii. 6; Ps. ii. 7; Acts xiii. 33.

incarnation and the suffering it involved; or, in other words, it is explained why if Christ is really greater than the angels, He had to be made a little lower than they.

τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος . . . "having become as much superior to the angels as He has obtained a more excellent name than they". The form of comparison here used, τοσ. . . . ὅσῳ is found also, vii. 20-22, viii. 6, x. 25; also in Philo. κρείττων is one of the words most necessary in an Epistle in which comparison is never out of sight. The Son *became* (γενόμενος) greater than the angels in virtue of taking His seat at God's right hand. This exaltation was the result of His earthly work. It is as Mediator of the new revelation, who has cleansed the sinful by His death, that He assumes supremacy. And this is in keeping with and in fulfilment of His obtaining the name of Son. This name κεκληρονόμηκεν, He has obtained, not "von Anfang an" as Bleek and others say, but as Riehm points out, in the O.T. The Messiah, then future, was spoken of as Son; and therefore to the O.T. reference is at once made in proof. The Messianic Sonship no doubt rests upon the Eternal Sonship, but it is not the latter but the former that is here in view.

In support of this statement the writer adduces an abundance of evidence, no fewer than seven passages being cited from the O.T. Before considering these, two preliminary objections may first be removed. (1) To us nothing may seem less in need of proof than that Christ who has indelibly impressed Himself on mankind is superior to the angels who are little more than a picturesque adornment of earthly life. But when this writer lived the angels may be said to have been in possession, whereas Christ had yet to win His inheritance. Moreover, as Schoettgen shows (p. 905) it was usual and needful to make good the proposition, "Messias major est Patriarchis, Mose, et Angelis ministerialibus". Prof. Odgers, too, has shown (*Proceedings of Soc. of Hist. Theol.*, 1895-6) that quite possibly the writer had in view some Jewish Gnostics who believed that Christ Himself belonged to the angelic creation and had, with the angels, a fluid personality and no proper human nature. In any case it was worth the writer's while to carry home to the conviction of his contemporaries that a mediation accomplished by one who was tempted and suffered and wrought righteousness, a mediation of an ethical and spiritual kind, must supersede a mediation accomplished by physical marvels and angelic ministries. (2) The passages cited from the Old Testament in proof of Christ's superiority although their immediate historical application is disregarded, are confidently adduced in accordance with the universal use of Scripture in the writer's time. But it must not be supposed that these passages are culled at random. With all his contemporaries this writer believed that where statements were made of an Israelitish king or other official in an ideal form not presently realised in those directly addressed or spoken of, these were considered to be Messianic, that is to say, destined to find their fulfilment and realisation in the Messiah. These interpretations of Scripture were the inevitable result of faith in God. The people were sure that God would somehow and at some time fulfil the utmost of His promise.

The first two quotations (ver. 5) illustrate the giving of the more excellent name; the remaining quotations exhibit the superiority of the Son to angels, or more definitely the supreme rule and imperishable nature of the Son, in contrast to the perishable nature and servile function of the angels.

Ver. 5. τίνι γὰρ εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων . . . "For to which of the angels did he ever say My Son art Thou, I this day have begotten Thee?" τίνι to what individual; ποτε in the whole course of history. The angels as a class are called "Sons of Elohim" in the O.T. (Gen. vi. 2; Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7; Job i. 6). But this was not used in its strict sense but merely as expressive of indefinite greatness, nor was it addressed to any individual. εἶπεν, the subject unexpressed, as is common in citing Scripture (2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16; Eph. iv. 8, etc.). Winer and Blass supply ὁ θεός, others ἡ γραφή. Warfield, who gives the fullest treatment of the subjectless use of λέγει, φησί, and such words

f Ps. xcvii. 7; Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 18.

εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν;" 6. f ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει, "Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν

(*Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, July, 1899) holds that either subject may be supplied, because "under the force of their conception of Scripture as an oracular book it was all one to the N.T. writers whether they said 'God says' or 'Scripture says'." Here, however, the connection involves that the subject is **ὁ θεός**. The words cited are from Ps. ii. 7 and are in verbal agreement with the LXX, which again accurately represents the Hebrew. The psalm was written to celebrate the accession of a King, Solomon or some other; but the writer, seeing in his mind's eye the ideal King, clothes the new monarch in his robes. The King was called God's Son on the basis of the promise made to David (2 Sam. vii. 14) and quoted in the following clauses: The words **ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε** do not seem to add much to the foregoing words, except by emphasising them, according to the ordinary method of Hebrew poetry. **σήμερον** is evidently intended to mark a special occasion or crisis and cannot allude to the eternal generation of the Son. In its original reference it meant "I have begotten Thee to the kingly dignity". It is not the beginning of life, but the entrance on office that is indicated by **γεγέννηκα**, and it is as King the person addressed is God's Son. Thus Paul, in his address to the Pisidians (Acts xiii. 33), applies it to the Resurrection of Christ; *cf.* Rom. i. 4. The words, then, find their fulfilment in Christ's Resurrection and Ascension and sitting down at God's right hand as Messiah. He was thus proclaimed King, begotten to the royal dignity, and in this sense certainly no angel was ever called God's Son.

This is more fully illustrated by another passage introduced by the usual **καὶ πάλιν** (see x. 30, and Longinus, *De Subl.*, chap. iv, etc.). **Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα . . .**, words spoken in God's name by Nathan in reference to David's seed, and conveying to him the assurance that the kings of his dynasty should ever enjoy the favour and protection and inspiration enabling them to rule as God's representatives. This promise is prior in history to the previous quotation, and is its source; see 2 Sam. vii. 14. **ἔσομαι εἰς** is Hellenistic after a Hebrew model. See Blass, *Gram.*, p. 85.

Ver. 6. **ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ . . .** "And when He shall again have brought the first-begotten into the world [of men], He says, "And let all God's angels worship Him". Having shown that "Son" is a designation reserved for the Messiah and not given to any of the angels, the writer now advances a step and adduces a Scripture which shows that the relation of angels to the Messiah is one of worship. It is not easy to determine whether **πάλιν** merely indicates a fresh quotation (so Bleek, Bruce, etc.) as in ver. 5; or should be construed with **εἰσαγάγῃ**. On the whole, the latter is preferable. Both the position of **πάλιν** and the tense of **εἰσαγ.** seem to make for this construction. The "bringing in" is still future. Apparently it is to the second Advent reference is made; *cf.* ix. 28. To refer **εἰσαγ.** to the incarnation, with Chrysostom, Calvin, Bengel, Bruce (see esp. Schoettgen); or to the resurrection with Grotius; or to an imagined introduction of the Son to created beings at some past period, with Bleek, is, as Weiss says, "sprachwidrig". Rendall remarks: "The words *bring in* have here a legal significance; they denote the introduction of an heir into his inheritance, and are used by the LXX with reference to putting Israel in possession of his own land both in the time of Joshua and at the Restoration (Exod. vi. 8, xv. 17; Deut. xxx. 5)." This throws light not only on **εἰσαγ.** but also on **πρωτότοκον** and **οἰκουμένην**, and confirms the interpretation of the clause as referring to the induction of the first-born into His inheritance, the world of men. **πρωτότ.** is used of Christ (1) in relation to the other children of Mary (Luke ii. 7; Matt. i. 25); (2) in relation to other men (Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 18); (3) in relation to creation (Col. i. 15). Nowhere else in N.T. is it used absolutely; but *cf.* Ps. lxxxix. 27. "I will make him first-born," *i.e.*, superior in dignity and closer in intimacy. **λέγει**, the present is used because the words recorded in Scripture and still unfulfilled are meant. These words, **καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν . . .** occur verbatim in Moses' song (Deut. xxxii. 43). In the Alexandrian text, from which this writer usually quotes, we find **υἱοὶ Θεοῦ** (*v.* Swete's LXX), but in a copy of the song subjoined to the Psalter this MS. itself has **ἄγγελοι**. The words are not represented in the Hebrew, and

σάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ". 7. [g]Καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει, "Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα". 8. [h]πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν, "Ὁ

[g] Ps. civ. 4. [h] Ps. xlv. 6.

are supposed by Delitzsch to have been added in the liturgical use of Moses' song. The part of the song to which they are attached represents the coming of God to judgment, a fact which further favours the view that it is the second Advent our author has in view.

Ver. 7. **καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει. . . .** The **πρὸς μὲν** of this verse is balanced by **πρὸς δὲ** in ver. 8; and in both **πρός** is to be rendered "with reference to," or "of" as in Luke xx. 19; Rom. x. 21; Xen., *Mem.*, iv. 2-15. *Cf.* Winer, p. 505: and our own expression "speak to such and such a point". **ὁ ποιῶν κ.τ.λ.** cited from Ps. civ. 4, Lünemann and others hold that the Hebrew is wrongly rendered and means "who maketh winds his messengers" not "who maketh His angels winds". Calvin, too, finds no reference to angels in the words. He believes that in this Hymn of Creation the Psalmist, to illustrate how God is in all nature, says "who maketh the winds his messengers," *i.e.*, uses for his purposes the apparently wildest of natural forces, and "flaming fire his ministers," the most rapid, resistless and devouring of agents controlled by the Divine hand. *Cf.* Shakespeare, "thought-executing fires". The writer accepts the LXX translation and it serves his purpose of exhibiting that the characteristic function of angels is service, and that their form and appearance depend upon the will of God. This was the current Jewish view. Many of the sayings quoted by Schoettgen and Weber suggest that with some of the Rabbis the belief in angels was little more than a way of expressing their faith in a spiritual, personal power behind the forces of nature. "When they are sent on a mission to earth, they are wind: when they stand before God they are fire." The angel said to Manoah, "I know not after what image I am made, for God changes us every hour; why, then, dost thou ask after my name? Sometimes He makes us fire, at others wind; sometimes men, at other times angels." Sometimes they appear to have no individual existence at all, but are merely the light-radiance or halo of God's glory. "No choir of angels sings God's praises twice, for each day God creates new hosts which sing His praises and then vanish into the stream of fire from under the throne of His glory whence they came." *Cf.* also the Book of Jubilees, ii. 2. "On the first day He created the heavens which are above and the earth and the waters and all the spirits which serve before Him—the angels of the presence, and the angels of sanctification, and the angels of the spirit of the winds, and the angels of the spirit of the clouds, and of darkness, and of snow and of hail, and of hoar frost, and the angels of the voices of the thunder and of the lightning, and the angels of the spirits of cold and of heat, and of winter and of spring, and of autumn and of summer, and of all the spirits of His creatures which are in the heavens and on the earth, the abysses and the darkness, eventide and the light, dawn and day which He hath prepared in the knowledge of His heart." One thing all these citations serve to bring out is that the angels were merely servants; like the physical forces of nature they were dependent and perishable. In contrast to these qualities are those ascribed to the Son.

Ver. 8. **πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν . . .,** the quotation being from Ps. xlv. in which the King in God's kingdom is described ideally. The points in the quotation which make it relevant to the writer's purpose are the ascription of *dominion and perpetuity* to the Son. The emphatic words, therefore, are **θρόνος, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ῥάβδος,** and **παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου.** It does not matter, therefore, whether we translate "Thy throne is God" or "Thy throne, O God," for the point here to be affirmed is not that the Messiah is Divine, but that He has a throne and everlasting dominion. Westcott adopts the rendering "God is thy throne," and compares Ps. lxxi. 3; Isa. xxvi. 4; Ps. xc. 1, xci. 1, 2; Deut. xxx. 27. He thinks it scarcely possible that "God" can be addressed to the King. Vaughan, on the other hand, says: "Evidently a vocative. *God is thy throne* might possibly have been said (Ps. xlvi. 1): *thy throne is God* seems an unnatural phrase. And even in its first (human) application the vocative would cause no difficulty (Ps. lxxxii. 6; John x. 34, 35)." Weiss strongly advocates this construction, and speaks of the other as quite given up. **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τ. αἰῶνος,** "to the age of the age," "for

θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεὸς, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος[1]· ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἡ
i Acts x. 38. ῥάβδος[2] τῆς βασιλείας σου.[3] 9. [i] ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην, καὶ
ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεός σου, ἔλαιον
k Ps. cii. 25. ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου." 10. [k] Καὶ, "Σὺ κατ' ἀρχὰς,

[1] Insert και with ℵABD*E*M, 17.
[2] T.R. in DEKLP al fere omn; η ραβδος ευθ. ραβδος with ℵABM.
[3] αυτου in ℵB; σου in ADEKLMP.

ever and ever," "to all eternity." *Cf.* Eph. iii. 21, **εἰς πάσας τ. γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τ. αἰώνων,** and the frequent **εἰς τ. αἰῶνας τ. αἰώνων.** See others in Vaughan or Concordance. "The aim of all these varieties of expression is the same; to heap up masses of time as an approximation to the conception of eternity" (Vaughan). **καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς εὐθύτητος ῥάβδος τ. βασιλείας σου.** The less strongly attested reading [see notes] gives the better sense: The sceptre of thy kingdom is a sceptre of uprightness. The well-attested reading gives the sense: "The sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom". The everlasting dominion affirmed in the former clause is now declared to be a righteous rule. An assurance of this is given in the the further statement.

Ver. 9. **ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην . . .** "Thou lovedst righteousness and didst hate lawlessness, therefore God, thy God, anointed thee with oil of gladness above thy fellows." The quotation is verbatim from LXX of Ps. xlv. 8 [the Alexand. text reads **ἀδικίαν** in place of **ἀνομίαν,** so that the author used a text not precisely in agreement with that of Cod: Alex. *v.* Weiss]. The anointing as King is here said to have been the result [**διὰ τοῦτο**] of his manifestation of qualities fitting him to rule as God's representative, namely, love of right and hatred of iniquity. [**ἀνομία** is used in 1 John iii. 4, as the synonym and definition of **ἁμαρτία. ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία.** It is contrasted with **δικαιοσύνη** in 2 Cor. vi, 14, **τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀνομίᾳ;**] It is the Messiah's love of righteousness as manifested in His earthly life which entitles Him to sovereignty. **ὁ Θεός** is taken as a vocative here, as in ver. 8, by Lünemann, Weiss and others; and **ὁ Θεός σου** as the direct nom. to **ἔχρισε.** Westcott thinks that the **ἔλαιον ἀγαλλ.** refers "not to the solemn anointing to royal dignity but to the festive anointing on occasions of rejoicing". So Alford. Davidson, on the other hand, says: "As Kings were anointed when called to the throne, the phrase means made King". So, too, Weiss and von Soden. But the psalm is not a coronation ode, but an epithalamium; the epithalamium, indeed, of the ideal King, but still a festive marriage song (vv. 10-17), to which the festal **ἔλαιον ἀγαλ.** is appropriate. The oil of exultation is the oil expressive of intense joy (*cf.* ver. 15 of the psalm). The only objection to this view is that God is said to be the anointer, but this has its parallel in Ps. xxiii. 5.; and throughout Ps. xlv. God is considered the originator of the happiness depicted (*cf.* ver. 2). Whether the marriage rejoicings are here to be applied to the Messiah in terms of vv. 16 and 17 of the psalm is doubtful. The verse is cited probably for the sake of the note of superiority contained in **παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου.** In the psalm the **μέτοχοι** are hardly other Kings; rather the companions and counsellors of the young King. In the Messianic application they are supposed by Bleek, Pierce, Alford, Davidson, Peake, etc., to be the angels. It seems preferable to keep the term indefinite as indicating generally the supremacy of Christ (*cf.* Ps. xlv. 2). —[**παρά** "From the sense of (1) *beside, parallel to,* comes that of (2) *in comparison with;* and so (3) in *advantageous* comparison with, *more than, beyond*". Vaughan].

Ver. 10. In vv. 10-12 the writer introduces another quotation from Ps. 102 (in LXX 101, 25-7). The quotation is verbatim from the LXX except that **σὺ** is lifted from the fifth to the first place in the sentence, for emphasis, and that a second **ὡς ἱμάτιον** is inserted after **αὐτούς** in ver. 12. With the introductory **καὶ** Weiss understands **πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν λέγει,** as in ver. 8. He is also of opinion that the writer considers that the words were spoken by Jehovah and that **κύριε,** therefore, must be the Messiah.

Κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ
οὐρανοί· 11. [1]αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, σὺ δὲ διαμένεις· καὶ πάντες ὡς
ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται, 12. καὶ ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον ἑλίξεις[1] αὐτοὺς[2]
καὶ ἀλλαγήσονται· σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσι".
13. [m]Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἴρηκέ ποτε, "Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,
ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου;" 14. [n]οὐχὶ
πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ

l Esa. li. 6; 2 Peter iii. 7, 10.
m x. 12, 13, et xii. 2; Ps. cx. 1; Matt. xxii. 44; Marc. xii. 36: Luc. xx. 42; Acts ii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Eph. i. 20.
n Ps. xxxiv. 7, et xci. 11.

[1] ελιξεις ABDᶜKLMP, Vulg., WH; αλλαξεις ℵ*D* 43, Tisch.

[2] Insert ως ιματιον with ℵABD*, d, e. Tisch. with KLMP omits as a gloss. It has the appearance of a homoioteleuton.

This is possible, but it is not necessary for the justification of the Messianic reference. This follows from the character of the psalm, which predicts the manifestation of Jehovah as the Saviour of His people, even though this may only be in the far future (see ver. 13: "Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion. . . . So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, etc.") Prof. B. W. Bacon of Yale has investigated this matter afresh and finds that, so far from the application of these verses to the Messiah being an audacious innovation, or even achieved, as Calvin says, "pia deflectione," "the psalm itself was a favourite resort of those who sought in even pre-Christian times for proof-texts of Messianic eschatology"; also that "we have specific evidence of the application of vv. 23, 24 to the Messiah by those who employed the Hebrew or some equivalent text" and finally that by the rendering of עָנָה in ver. 24 (English ver. 23) by *respondit* or ἀπεκρίθη "we have the explanation of how, in Christian circles at least, the accepted Messianic passage could be made to prove the doctrine that the Messiah is none other than the pre-existent wisdom of Prov. viii. 22-31, "through whom," according to our author, ver. 2, "God made the worlds." Indeed, we shall not be going too far if with Bruce we say: "It is possible that the writer (of Heb.) regarded this text (Ps. cii. 25-27) as Messianic because in his mind creation was the work of the pre-existent Christ. But it is equally possible that he ascribed creative agency to Christ out of regard to this and other similar texts believed to be Messianic on other grounds." See Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für N. T. Wissenschaft*, 1902, p. 280.

In vv. 13 and 14, we have the final contrast between the place of the Son and that of the angels in human redemptive history. This contrast is connected by the form of its statement with ver. 5 ("to which of the angels, etc."). There it was the greater name that was in question, here it is the higher station and function. **πρὸς τίνα δὲ κ.τ.λ.** "But to which of the angels has He at any time said . . .?" implying that to the Son He has said it, as is proved by the citation from Ps. cx. On this psalm (see note on ver. 9). **δὲ** connects this ver. with ver. 8, and stands in the third place as frequently in classics when a preposition begins the sentence (Herod., viii., 68, 2; Thuc., i., 6; Soph., *Philoct.*, 764. See examples in Klotz' *Devarius*, p. 379). **κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου**, see ver. 3; **ἐκ δεξ.** is not classical, but frequent in Hellenistic Greek, see references. **ἕως ἂν θῶ. . . .** "Until I set thine enemies as a footstool for thy feet." **ὑποπόδιον** is a later Greek word used in LXX and N.T. The figure arose from the custom of conquerors referred to in Josh. x. 24. Here it points to the complete supremacy of Christ. This attained sovereignty is the gauge of the World's consummation. The horizon of human history is the perfected rule of Jesus Christ. It is the end for which all things are now making. Whereas the angels are but the agents whose instrumentality is used by God for the furtherance of this end. **οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα. . . .** "Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to serve for the sake of those who are to obtain salvation?" They have no function of rule, but are directed by a higher will to promote the interests of those who are to form Christ's kingdom. This is true of *all* of them [**πάντες**] whatever hierarchies there be among them. **λειτουργικὰ**, *cf.* v. 5. **λειτουργός**

τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν; II. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο δεῖ περισσοτέρως ἡμᾶς προσέχειν τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι, μή ποτε παρα-

with its cognates has come to play a large part in ecclesiastical language. It is originally "a public servant"; from **λεῖτος**, an unused adjective connected with **λαός**, meaning "what belongs to the people" and **ἔργον**. It occurs frequently in LXX, sometimes denoting the official who attends on a king (Josh. i. 1), sometimes angels (Ps. ciii. 21), commonly the priests and Levites (Neh. x. 39), **οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ λειτουργοί**, and Is. lxi. 6. In N.T. it is used of those who render service to God or to Christ or to men (*cf.* Lepine's *Ministers of Jesus Christ*, p. 126). **εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα**, present part., denoting continuous action. "Sent forth"; therefore as servants by a higher power (*cf.* Acts i. 25, **διακονίας ταύτης κ. ἀποστολῆς**). **Διακονία** originally means the ministry of a body servant or table servant (*cf.* Luke iv. 39; Mark i. 13, **οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ**) and is used throughout N.T. for ministry in spiritual things. **μέλλοντας** might almost be rendered "destined" as in Matt. iii. 7, xi, 14, xvi. 27, xvii. 12, etc. **κληρονομεῖν**, see on ver. 4. **σωτηρίαν** in the classics means either preservation or deliverance. In N.T. the word naturally came to be used as the semi-technical term for the deliverance from sin and entrance into permanent wellbeing effected by Christ. See Luke i. 71, 77; John iv. 22; Acts iv. 12, xvi. 17; Rom. i. 16, etc. In ii. 3 the salvation referred to is termed **τηλικαύτη**. *Cf.* Hooker's outburst, *Eccles. Pol.*, i., iv., 1, and Sir Oliver Lodge (*Hibbert Journal*, Jan., 1903, p. 223): "If we are open to influence from each other by non-corporeal methods, may we not be open to influence from beings in another region or of another order? And if so, may we not be aided, inspired, guided by a cloud of witnesses—not witnesses only, but helpers, agents like ourselves of the immanent God?" On guardian angels, see Charles' *Book of Jubilees*, Moulton in *J. T. S.*, August 1902, and Rogers' edition of Aristoph., *Eccles.*, 999, and the Orphic Fragment quoted by Clement (*Strom.*, v.) **Σῷ δὲ θρόνῳ πυρόεντι παρεστᾶσιν πολυμόχθοι Ἄγγελοι οἷσι μέμηλε βροτοῖς ὡς πάντα τελεῖται.** *Cf.* Shakespeare's "Angels and *ministers of grace* defend us".

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-4. From this proved superiority of the Son to the angels the writer deduces the warning that neglect of the salvation proclaimed by the Lord Himself and attested by God in miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost will incur heavier punishment than that which was inflicted upon those who neglected the word spoken by angels.

Ver. 1. **Διὰ τοῦτο**: "on this account," because God has now spoken not through prophets or angels, but through a Son. **δεῖ . . . ἡμᾶς**: "we must give more excessive heed". "Alibi utitur verbo **ὀφείλειν** *debere*: hic **δεῖ** *oportet*. Illud dicit *obligationem*: hoc, urgens periculum"; Bengel, who also remarks on 1 Cor. xi. 10, **ὀφείλει** notat obligationem: **δεῖ** necessitatem; illud morale est, hoc quasi physicum; ut in vernaculâ, wir sollen und müssen". Here then it is the logical necessity that is prominent. **περισσοτέρως** is to be joined not with **δεῖ** as in Vulg. (and Bengel), "abundantius oportet observare," but with **προσέχειν**. The adverb occurs in xiii. 19 and six times in 2 Cor.; the adj. frequently in N.T. **περισσοτέρως** [**περιττοτέρως**] occurs in Diod. Sic., xiii. 108, **τὰ περ. εἰργασμένα**; also in Athenaeus, v., p. 192 F. **κλισμὸς περιτ. κεκόσμηται.** The comparative is here used with reference to the greater attention due to the revelation than if it had been delivered by one of less position. Atto Vercell. suggestively, "Quare abundantius . . . Nonne et illa Dei sunt et ista?" His answer being that those who had been brought up to reverence the O.T. might be apt to despise the new revelation. **προσέχειν** never in N.T. and only once in LXX (Job vii. 17) has the added **τὸν νοῦν** usual in classics. As **προσέχειν** is commonly used of bringing a ship to land, this sense may have suggested the **παραῤῥύνωμεν. ἡμᾶς**, including himself, but meaning to indicate all who in these last days had heard the revelation of Christ. **τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν**: "the things heard," the great salvation first preached by the Lord, ver. 3; *cf.* Acts viii. 6, xvi. 14. He means to disclose the significance of what they have already heard, rather than to bring forward new truth. **μὴ ποτε παραῤῥυῶμεν**: "lest haply we drift away". **μή ποτε**, as Hoogeveen shows, occurs in N.T. as = *ne quando* and also as = *ne forte*; but

ρρυῶμεν.[1] 2. [a]εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος ἐγένετο βέβαιος, καὶ πᾶσα παράβασις καὶ παρακοὴ ἔλαβεν ἔνδικον μισθαποδοσίαν, 3. [b]πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας; ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὑπὸ τῶν

[a] Deut. xxvii. 26; Acts vii. 38, 53; Gal. iii. 19.
[b] xii. 25; Matt. iv. 17; Marc. i. 14.

[1] παραρυωμεν with ℵAB*D*LP, 17, 47, 115. Bleek favours the T.R. See also the forms given by Veitch.

in clauses expressing apprehension, as here, it can always be rendered "lest perchance". ["In Hellenistic Greek **μήποτε** in a principal clause means 'perhaps,' in a dependent clause 'if perchance,' 'if possibly,'" Blass, p. 212.] **παραῤῥυῶμεν** is 2nd aor. subj. pass. (with neuter meaning) of **παραῤῥέω**, I flow beside or past; as in Xen., *Cyrop.*, iv. 52, **πιεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ παραῤῥέοντος ποταμοῦ**. Hence, to slip aside; as in Soph., *Philoct.*, 653, of an arrow slipping from the quiver; in Xen., *Anab.*, iv. 4, of snow slipping off; Ælian, *V. H.*, iii. 30, of a coarse story unseasonably slipping into a discreet conversation; and in medical writers, frequently of food slipping aside into the windpipe. Origen (*Contra Celsum*, 393) says the multitude need fixed holy days, **ἵνα μὴ τέλεον παραῤῥυῇ**, "that they may not quite drift away". See also Prov. iii. 21, **υἱέ, μὴ παραῤῥυῇς, τήρησον δὲ ἐμὴν βουλήν.**

Ver. 2. **εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος. . . .** An *a fortiori* argument derived from the notoriously inevitable character of the punishment which overtook those who disregarded the Law. "The word spoken through angels" is the Law, the characteristic and fundamental form under which the old revelation had been made. The belief that angels mediated the Law is found in Deut. xxxiii. 2; Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Josephus, *Ant.*, xv. 53. **ἐγένετο βέβαιος**: "proved steadfast," inviolable, held good; as in Rom. iv. 16, of the promise **εἰς τὸ εἶναι βέβαιαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.** The sanctions of the law were not a mere *brutum fulmen*. This appeared in the fact that **πᾶσα παράβασις . . .** "every transgression and disobedience". **παράβασις** is transgression of a positive command: **παρακοή** is neglect to obey. Grotius renders παρακ. by "contumacia" which may be involved; but Böhme is right in his note "non commissa solum, sed omissa etiam". The inflictions, whether on individuals, as Achan, or on the whole people, as in the wilderness-generation, were "a just recompense," not an arbitrary, or excessive punishment. For **μισθαποδοσία** classical writers use **μισθοδοσία.**

Ver. 3. **πῶς ἡμεῖς. . . .** "How shall we"—to whom God has spoken through the Son, i. 2—"escape (**ἔνδικον μισθ.** prob. in final judgment, as in x. 27) if we have neglected (the aorist **ἀμελήσαντες** suggesting that life is looked at as a whole) so great a salvation?"—the salvation which formed the main theme of the new revelation. The meaning of **ἀμελήσαντες** is best illustrated by Matt. xxii. 5, where it is used of those who disregarded, or treated with contempt, the invitation to the marriage-supper. The guilt and danger of so doing are in proportion to the greatness of the announcement, and this is no longer of law but of life, *cf.* 2 Cor. iii. The word now spoken is vastly more glorious and more fully expressive of its Author than the Law, "Non erat *tanta* salus in V.T., quanta est in gratia quam Dei filius nobis attulit" (Atto Vercell:). The "greatness" of the salvation is involved in the greatness of Him who mediates it (i. 4), of the method employed (ii. 10), of the results, *many* sons being brought to *glory* (ii. 10). But one relevant aspect of its greatness, the source and guaranteed truth of its proclamation is introduced by **ἥτις**, which here retains its proper qualitative sense and may be rendered "inasmuch as it . . .". "Its object is to introduce the mention of a characteristic quality, which explains or emphasises the thing in question" (Vaughan). It was the trustworthiness of the new revelation of salvation which the Hebrews were beginning to question. The law had proved its validity by punishing transgressors but the majesty and certainty of the recent proclamation were doubtful. Therefore the writer insists that it is "very great," and illustrates its trustworthiness by adducing these three features: (1) its original proclamation by the Lord, (2) its confirmation by those who heard Him, (3) its miraculous certi-

ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη, 4. [c] συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου μερισμοῖς, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν.

c Marc. xvi. 20; Acts ii. 22, et xiv. 3, et xix. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 4, 7, 11.

fication by God. [This is not contradicted by Bleek's "Das τηλικ., tantae talisque salutis, verweist an sich wohl nicht auf den nachfolgenden relativen Satz," nor by Weiss' "Das ἥτις hängt weder sprachlich noch sachlich mit τηλικ. zusammen."] **ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι,** lit.: "having received a beginning to be spoken" = "having begun to be spoken," or "which was first proclaimed". **ἀρχὴν λαβ.**, a common phrase in later Greek, see Stephanus and Wetstein. In Polybius of a war "taking its rise". In Ælian, *V. H.*, ii. 28. **πόθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ὅδε ὁ νόμος, ἐρῶ.** It is used here to indicate with precision the origin of the proclamation of the revelation about which they are feeling uncertain. **λαλεῖσθαι** refers back to ver. 2 and also to i. 1. **διὰ** to be connected with **ἀρχὴν λαβ.**; it is used instead of **ὑπὸ** because God is throughout viewed as the ultimate source of revelation. **τοῦ Κυρίου,** "the Lord" supreme over angels, and whose present exaltation reflects dignity and trustworthiness on the revelation He made while on earth. The salvation which they are tempted to neglect was at first proclaimed not by angels sent out to minister, not by servants or delegates who might possibly misapprehend the message, but by the Lord Himself, the Supreme. The source then is unquestionably pure. Has the stream been contaminated? God testifies to its purity. There is only one link between the Lord and you, they that heard Him delivered the message to you, and God by witnessing with them certifies its truth. The main verb is **ἐβεβαιώθη** which looks back to **βέβαιος** of ver. 2, and compares the inviolability of the one word or revelation with that of the other. We must not, he argues, neglect a gospel of whose veracity and importance we have assurance in this, that it was first proclaimed by the Lord Himself and that we have it on the authority of those who themselves heard Him, and who therefore were first-hand witnesses who had also made experimental verification of its validity. For **ἀκουσάντων** though without an object expressed, plainly means those who heard the Lord, *cf.* Luke i. 1. **εἰς ἡμᾶς** is rendered by Theophylact **διεπορθμεύθη εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαίως,** it has been conveyed to us in a trustworthy manner. To their testimony was added the all-convincing witness borne by God, **συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ.** The word is found in Aristotle, Philo and Polybius, xxvi. 9, 4, **παρόντων δὲ τῶν Θετταλῶν καὶ συνεπιμαρτυρούντων τοῖς Δαρδανίοις.** Also in Clement, *Ep.*, c. xxiii., **συνεπιμαρτυρούσης τῆς γραφῆς**; but only here in N.T., *cf.* 1 Pet. v. 12; Rom. ii. 15, viii. 16, ix. 1. The sense is found in Mark xvi. 20, **ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου συνεργοῦντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων.** This witness was borne **σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν** "by signs and wonders," the two words referring to the same manifestations (**τε καὶ** closely uniting the words), which in one aspect were "signs" suggesting a Divine presence or a spirtual truth, and in another aspect "wonders" calculated to arrest attention. [The words are similarly conjoined in Polybius, Plutarch, Ælian, Philo and Josephus.] **καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν** "and various miracles," lit. powers, as in Matt. xi. 21, **καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλάς.** Bleek thinks it is not the outward manifestations but the powers themselves that are here meant. This, he thinks, is suggested by the connexion of the word with **πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς,** "distributions of the Holy Spirit". The genitive is genitive objective, "distributions consisting of the Holy Spirit". The remarkable character of the Charismata and the testimony they bore to a Divine presence and power are frequently alluded to in the N.T. and are enlarged upon in 1 Cor. xii. 14. Paul uses the same argument as this writer in Gal. iii. 1-4. The article is wanting before **πνεύματος** in accordance with the usage noted by Vaughan, that it is generally omitted when the communication of the Spirit is spoken of, *cf.* Luke ii. 25, John vii. 39, with John xiv. 26, Acts xix. 2 with 6. **μερισμός** only here and in a different sense in iv. 12; the verb is common. St. Paul uses it in connection with the distribution of spiritual gifts in Rom. xii. 3, 1 Cor. vii. 17. No one thought himself possessed of the fulness of the Spirit, only a **μέρος.** These distributions or apportionings, being of the Spirit of God, are necessarily

5. [d] **Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξε τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν.** 6. [e] **διεμαρτύρατο δέ πού τις λέγων, "Τί ἐστιν**

d i. 2, 4, 8; 2 Peter iii. 13.
e Ps. viii. 4, et cxliv. 3.

made **κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν** "according to His [God's] will". In 1 Cor. xii. 11 the will is that of the Spirit. "Non omnibus omnia dabat Deus, sed quae et quantum et quibus vellet, Eph. iv. 7" (Grotius). [**θέλησις** only here in N.T., but ten times in LXX. Pollux calls it a "vulgarism" **ἰδιωτικόν.** On the substitution of nouns in **-μα** for nouns in **-σις,** see Jannaris' *Hist. Gram.*, p. 1024, and *cf.* x. 7, ix. 36, xiii. 21, so that in the present passage the choice of the active form is deliberate.] The clause is added to enforce the writer's contention that all the Charismata with which his readers were familiar were not mere fruits of excitement or in any way casual, but were the result of a Divine intention to bear witness to the truth of the gospel.

Vv. 5-18. Having sufficiently brought out the permanence and sovereignty of the Son by contrasting them with the fleeting personality and ministerial function of angels, the author now proceeds to bring the supremacy of the Son into direct relation to the Messianic administration of "the world to come," the ideal condition of human affairs; and to explain why for the purposes of this administration it was needful and seemly that "the Lord" should for a season appear in a form "a little lower than the angels". The world of men as it was destined to be [**ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα**] was a condition of things in which man was to be supreme, not subject to any kind of slavery or oppression. And if the Jew asked why, in order to bring this about, the appearance of the Son in so apparently inglorious a form was necessary; if he asked why suffering and death on His part were necessary, the answer is, that it was God's purpose to bring, not angels, but many human sons to glory and that as there is but one path, and that a path of suffering, by which men can reach their destiny, it was becoming that their leader should act as pioneer in this path. His path to glory must be a path in which men can follow Him; because it is from the human level and as man that He wins to glory. More particularly His sufferings accomplish two objects: they produce in Him the sympathy which qualifies Him as High Priest, while His death breaks the power which kept them enslaved and in fear. [On this section Robertson Smith's papers in the *Expositor*, 1881-2, should be consulted.]

Ver. 5. **Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις. . . .** "For not to angels". With **γὰρ** the writer proceeds to clinch the exhortation contained in vv. 1-4, by exhibiting the ground of it. Under the old Covenant angels had been God's messengers, but this mode of mediation has passed away. The **οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα** is not subject to them. It is the Son as man who now rules and to whom attention must be given. **ὑπέταξεν. . .** "did He"—that is God—subject the world to come of which we are speaking, **ἡ οἰκουμένη,** not **κόσμος,** but the inhabited world. So used in Diod. Sic., i. 8 **καθ' ἅπασαν τ. οἰκουμένην,** wherever there were men. From the O.T. point of view "the world to come" meant the world under Messianic rule, but in this Epistle the Messianic Kingdom is viewed as not yet fully realised. The world to come is therefore the eternal order of human affairs already introduced and rendering obsolete the temporary and symbolic dispensation. Calvin accurately defines it thus: "Non vocari orbem futurum duntaxat, qualem e resurrectione speramus, sed qui coepit ab exordio regni Christi. Complementum vero suum habebit in ultima redemptione." It is the present world of men regenerated, death and all that is inimical to human progress abolished; a condition in which all things are subjected to man. The repudiation of angels as lords of the world to come implies the admission that the obsolescent dispensation had been subject to them. So in Deut. xxxii. 8: **ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ,** *cf.* Dan. x. 13-21 and *Book of Jubilees*, xv. 31. *Cf.* the pages in which Robertson Smith expands the remark that "to be subordinated" to the angelic dispensation is the same thing as to be "made under the law" (*Expositor*, 1881, p. 144 ff.). Hermas (*Vis.*, iii. 4, 1) represents the Church as being built by six angels whom he describes as being the first created **οἷς παρέδωκεν ὁ Κύριος πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν αὐτοῦ, αὔξειν καὶ οἰκοδομεῖν καὶ δεσπόζειν τῆς κτίσεως πάσης.**

Ver 6. **διεμαρτύρατο δὲ πού τις λέγων:** "but some one in a certain place solemnly testifies, saying". The indefinite formula of quotation is used not because doubt existed regarding the authorship of the psalm, nor because the writer was citing

ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ· ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπτῃ
f Ps. viii. 6; Matt. xxviii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 27; Eph. i. 22. αὐτόν; 7. ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους· δόξῃ καὶ
τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτὸν, καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν
χειρῶν σου[1]· 8. [f]πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ."

[1] This clause **καὶ κατέστησας** is omitted from B, and the sense favours the omission.

from memory, but rather as a rhetorical mode of suggesting that his readers knew the passage well enough. So Chrysostom: **δεικνύντος ἐστίν, αὐτοὺς σφόδρα ἐμπείρους εἶναι τῶν γραφῶν.** Philo frequently uses an indefinite form of quotation: this identical form in *De Ebriet.*, 14 (Wendland, ii. 181) **εἶπε γάρ πού τις.** *Cf.* Longinus, *De Sub.*, ix. 2 **γέγραφά που.** Here only in the Epistle is a quotation from Scripture referred to its human author. **τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος. . . .** The quotation is from Ps. viii. and extends to **ποδῶν αὐτοῦ** in ver. 8. It illustrates the greatness of man in three particulars.

1. **ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους.**

2. **δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν.**

3. **πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.**

And the author goes on to say that in Jesus the two former elements of man's greatness are seen to be fulfilled (He is made a little lower than the angels, and He is crowned with glory and honour), while the third is guaranteed because Jesus has tasted death for every man and so subdued even it, the last enemy, and therefore all things, under his feet.

In Ps. viii. as in so many other poets and prose writers (see Pascal's chapter on *The Greatness and Littleness of Man*, A. R. Wallace's *Man's Place in the Universe* and Fisk's *Destiny of Man*), it is the dignity put upon man which fills the writer with astonishment. When Sophocles in the *Antigone* celebrates man's greatness, **πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κοὐδὲν ἀνθρώπου δεινότερον πέλει,** he excepts death from subjection to man, **Ἅιδα μόνον φεῦξιν οὐκ ἐπάξεται.** Here the Hebrew poet excepts nothing. But only by Christ was he justified. Man's real place is first won by Christ. **μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ** "Thou art mindful of him" for good as in xiii. 3. Man, the subject of satire and self-contempt, is the object of God's thought. **υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου** = **ἄνθρωπος** of the first clause. In the Heb. אֱנוֹשׁ and בֶּן־אָדָם· **ἐπισκέπτῃ** "visit," generally as a friend (Mat. xxv. 36, James i. 27) frequently of physician visiting sick; in judgment, Jer. v. 9, 29. "The day of visitation," **ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς,** in good sense, Luke xix. 44; for chastisement, Isa. x. 3; *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 12. In Jer. xv. 15 we have the two words **μνήσθητί μου καὶ ἐπίσκεψαί με.**

Ver. 7. That God has been mindful of man and visited him is apparent in the three particulars now mentioned. **βραχύ τι** is "a little," either in material, or in space, or in time. In 1 Sam. xiv. 29, **ἐγευσάμην βραχύ τι τ. μέλιτος.** In Isa. lvii. 17, of time, **δι' ἁμαρτίαν βραχύ τι ἐλύπησα αὐτον.** So in N.T., of aterial, Jo. vi. 7; of space, Acts xxvii. 28; of time Acts, v. 34. So in classics, *v.* Bleek. The original of the psalm points to the translation: "Thou didst make him little lower than the angels" [in the Heb. מֵאֱלֹהִים "than God"]. There seems no reason to depart from this meaning either in this verse or in ver. 9. So Alford and Westcott, but Davidson and Weiss and several others are of opinion that as the words are in ver. 9 applied to the Messiah, whose superiority has been so insisted upon, an allusion to His inferiority would be out of place; "and that the phrase should be used of degree in one place and time in another, when the point of the passage lies in the identity of the Son's history with that of man, is an idea only puerile" (Davidson). But on any rendering the inferiority of Jesus to angels so far as dying goes is granted, and there is no reason why the sense of degree should not be kept in both clauses. **δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ** frequently conjoined, Rev. xxi. 26; 1 Tim. i. 17; Thucyd., iv. 86; Plut., *Num.*, 51; Lucian *Somn.*, 13.

Ver. 8. **πάντα ὑπέταξας. . . .** "Thou didst put all things under his feet." In the psalm "all things" are defined as "all sheep and oxen, yea and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passes through the paths of the sea". But to our author the scope of the "all" has

Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον· νῦν δὲ οὔπω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα. 9. [g] τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, [g] Acts ii. 33; Phil. ii. 7, 8, 9.

been enlarged by the event. His argument requires an absolutely universal subjection, so that everything obstructive of man's "glory" may be subdued. And having seen this achieved by Christ, he is emboldened to give to "all" this fullest content. The one point he seeks to make good is that "in subjecting all things to him, he has left nothing, *and therefore not the* **οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα**, unsubjected to him". The "world to come" is under human dominion and administration. The angels are left behind; there is no room for angelic government. But this very sovereignty of man is precisely that which we do not see visibly fulfilled: "for the present (**νῦν**) we do not yet see all things subjected to him". True, says the author, but we do see Jesus who for the suffering of death (or that He might suffer death) has been made a little lower than angels, crowned with glory and honour that by God's grace He might taste death for every man. In other words, we see the first two items of man's supremacy, as given in the psalm, fulfilled, and the third guaranteed. Jesus was (1) made a little lower than angels; (2) was crowned with glory and honour; and (3) by dying for every man has removed that last obstacle, the fear of death which kept men in **δουλεία** and hindered them from supreme dominion over all things. The construction of the sentence is much debated. But it must be admitted that any construction which makes the coronation subsequent to the tasting death for every man, is unnatural; the **ὅπως** depends upon **ἐστεφανωμένον**. And the difficulty which has been felt in giving its natural sense to this clause has been introduced by supposing that **δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφ.** refers to the heavenly state of Jesus. On this understanding it is of course difficult to see how it could be said that Jesus was crowned in order to taste death. But as undoubtedly the first clause, **ἠλαττουμένον βλέπομεν**, refers to the earthly life of Jesus, it is natural to suppose that the second clause, which speaks of his being crowned, also refers to that life. The tenses are the same. But if so, what was the crowning here referred to? It was His recognition as Messiah, as the true Head and King of men. He was thus recognised by God at His baptism and at the Transfiguration [in connection with which the same words **δόξῃ κ. τιμῇ** are used, 2 Pet. i. 16-18] as well as by His disciples at Caesarea Philippi. It was this crowning alone which enabled Him to die a representative death, the King or Head for His people; it was this which fitted Him to taste death for *every* man. He was made a little lower than the angels that He might suffer death; but He was crowned with glory and honour that this very death might bring all men to the glory of supremacy which was theirs when the fear of death was removed; see v. 14, 15. For a fuller exposition of this view of the verse, see *Expository Times*, April, 1896. **χάριτι θεοῦ**, "by God's grace," to men, not directly to Jesus. It is remarkable that Weiss, an expert in textual criticism, should adopt the reading **χωρὶς θεοῦ** "apart from God" finding in these words a reference to the cry on the cross "My God, My God, etc.". The other meaning put upon the words, "except God," needs no comment. The Nestorians used the reading to prove that Christ suffered apart from His Divinity ("divinitate tantisper deposita **οὐ συνῆν ἡ θεότης**") but such a meaning can hardly be found in the words. **ὑπὲρ πάντος**, these are the emphatic words, bringing out the writer's point that Christ's victory and supremacy were not for Himself alone, but for men. [Chrysostom strikingly says.: **οὐχὶ τῶν πιστῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης· αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν· τί δὲ, εἰ μὴ πάντες ἐπίστευσαν; αὐτὸς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ πεπλήρωκε.**] **γεύσηται θανάτου** "he might taste death," *i.e.*, actually experience death's bitterness. The Greek commentators suppose the word is chosen to bring out the shortness of our Lord's experience of death, **μικρὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ποιήσας διάστημα.** This seems incorrect. [The rule, sometimes laid down,, that **γεύεσθαι** followed by an accusative means to partake freely, and by a genitive sparingly, cannot be universally applied. The ordinary distinction observed in the use of verbs of sense that they take the

h v. 9, et xii. 2; Luc. xxiv. 26, 46; Acts iii. 15, et v. 31; Rom. ii. 36; Phil. ii. 8, 9.

ὅπως χάριτι Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ[1] παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου.[2] 10. [h]*Ἔπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς

[1] T.R. is read in almost all the MSS. and versions and adopted by all editors. But **χωρις Θεου** is found in M, 67**, Origen.

[2] "Hic versus multas difficultates interpretationi affert. Fortasse v. 9b (**οπως . . . θανατου**) corruptus vel interpolatus est" (Baljon).

accusative of the nearer, the genitive of the remoter source of the sensation is much safer.] The expression **γευεσθαι θανάτου** does not occur in the classics, although we find **γευ. μόχθον** in Soph., *Trachin.*,1103,where the Scholiast renders by **ἐπειράθην**, in *Antig.*, 1005, where Jebb renders "proceeded to make trial of," in Eurip., *Hecuba*, 375, with **κακῶν** and in Plato, *Rep.*,475 with **πάντος μαθήματος.**

Vv. 10-18. The humiliation of tbe Son justified; "a condensed and pregnant view of the theory of the whole work of Christ, which subsequent chapters develop, eludicate, and justify dialectically, in contrast or comparison with the O.T. . . . The ultimate source of all doubt whether the new dispensation is superior to the old is nothing else than want of clear insight into the work of Christ, and especially into the significance of His passion, which, to the Jews, from whom the Hebrew Christians of our Epistle were drawn, was the chief stumbling-block in Christianity. Here, therefore, the writer has at length got into the heart of his subject, and, leaving the contrast between Christ and the angels, urges the positive doctrine of the identification of Jesus with those that are his—his brethren, the Sons of God whom He sanctifies—as the best key to that connection between the passion and glorification of Chr st which forms the cardinal point of N.T. revelation" (Robertson Smith). To this it may only be added that in order to prove man's supremacy and justify Psalm viii., it was essential that the writer should show that Christ was man, identified with humanity.

In justification then (justification introduced by **γὰρ**) of the subjection of Jesus to the **πάθημα θανάτου**, the writer proceeds to say **ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ** "it befitted Him". The expression, says Carpzov, is "frequentissima Philoni phrasis"; but in Scripture, at least in this sense, it stands alone: *cf.* Jer. x. 7; Ps. lxv. 1. Aristotle (*Nic. Eth.*, iv. 2-2: Burnet, p. 173) says that what is befitting is relative to the person, the circumstances and the object [**τὸ πρέπον δὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐν ᾧ καὶ περὶ ὅ**]. The object here in view, the "bringing many sons to glory," needs no justification. As Tertullian (*adv. Marcion*, ii. 27) says: "nihil tam dignum Deo, quam salus hominis". But that the means used by God to accomplish this end was not only fit to bring it about but was also **πρέπον θεῷ**, in other words, that Christ's humiliation and death were in accordance with the Divine nature, is the point the writer wishes to make good. "The whole course of nature and grace must find its explanation in God, and not merely in an abstract Divine *arbitrium*, but in that which befits the Divine nature". This matter of Christ's suffering has not been isolated in God's government but is of a piece with all He is and has done; it has not been handed over to chance, accident, or malevolent powers, but is part of the Divine rule and providence; it is not exceptional, unaccountable, arbitrary, but has its root and origin in the very nature of God. God acted freely in the matter, governed only by His own nature. "Man has not wholly lost the intuitive power by which the fitness of the Divine action, its correspondence to the idea standard of right which his conscience certifies and his reason approves, may be recognised" (Henson, *Disc. and Law*, p. 56). "It is worth noting that the chief value of Anselm's view of the Atonement lies in the introduction into theology of the idea of what befits God—the idea, as he puts it, of God's honour. Anselm fails, however, by thinking rather of what God's honour must receive as its due than of what it is seemly for God in His grace to do, and thus his theory becomes shallow and inadequate" (Robertson Smith). The writer does not say **ἔπρεπεν θεῷ** but **ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα** "Him on account of whom are all things and through whom are all things," who is the reason and the cause of all existence; in whom, there-

δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι. 11. [1]ὅ τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι, ἐξ ἑνὸς πάν- i x. 10, 14; Acts xvii. 26.

fore, everything must find its reason and justification. "Denn wenn um seinetwillen das All ist, also Alles seinen Zwecken dienen muss, und durch ihn das All ist, also nichts ohne sein Zuthun zu Stande kommt, so muss man bei Allem, was geschieht, und somit auch bei dem Todesleiden fragen, wiefern es ihm angemessen ist" (Weiss). The purpose of God is expressed in the words: **πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα** "in bringing many sons to glory". The accusative **ἀγαγ.** (although referring to **αὐτῷ**) does not require us to construe it with **ἀρχηγὸν**. That is a possible but clumsy construction. The use of **υἱοὺς** implies that the Father is the subject and leads us to expect that the action of God will be mentioned. And this construction, in which the dative of the subject becomes an accusative when an infinitive follows, is not unknown, but is merely a species of attraction—the infinitive drawing the noun into the case appropriate. *Cf.* Acts xi. 12, xv. 22; Luke i. 74. Examples from the classics in *Matthiae*, 535. The aorist participle has led the Vulgate to translate "qui multos filios in gloriam adduxerat," needlessly, for "the aorist participle is sometimes used adverbially in reference to an action evidently in a general way coincident in time with the action of the verb, yet not identical with it. The choice of the aorist participle rather than the present in such cases is due to the fact that the action is thought of, not as in progress, but as a simple event or fact (Burton, *M. and T.*, 149). **πολλοὺς υἱοὺς** "many" is not used with any reference to the population of the world, or to the proportion of the saved, but to the one Son already celebrated. It was God's purpose not only to have one Son in glory, but to bring many to be partakers with Him. Hence the difficulty; hence the need of the suffering of Christ. But it is not merely **πολλοὺς** but **πολλοὺς υἱοὺς** suggesting the relationship dwelt upon in the succeeding verses. **τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τ. σωτηρίας . . .** the author [pioneer] of their salvation indicating that feature of Christ's relation to the saved which determined His experience, "the Captain of their salvation". R.V. has "author" following Vulg. Chrysostom has **ἀρχηγὸν τουτέστι τὸν αἴτιον**, and so Robertson Smith, "it is hardly necessary to put more meaning into the phrase than is contained in the parallel expression of v. 9". So Bleek, Kübel and von Soden. But the word is select, and why select, if not to bring out precisely this, that in the present case the cause is also the leader, "that the Son goes before the saved in the same path". He is the strong swimmer who carries the rope ashore and so not only secures His own position but makes rescue for all who will follow. "The **ἀρχηγός** himself first takes part in that which he establishes" (Westcott). One of the chief points in the Epistle is that the Saviour is also **ἀρχηγός**. The word is commonly used of founders of tribes, rulers and commanders, persons who begin anything in become the source of anything, but or this Epistle (xii. 2) it has over and above the sense of "pioneer". **διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι**, "to perfect through sufferings". **τελειῶσαι** is to make **τέλειον**, to bring a person or thing to the appropriate **τέλος**, to complete, perfect, consummate. In the Pentateuch it is regularly used to denote the consecration of the priests. In the N.T. this consecration is no formal setting apart to office, but a preparation involving ethical fitness. So that here the word *directly* denotes making perfect as leader of salvation, but *indirectly* and by implication making morally perfect. And this moral perfection, requisite in one who was to cleanse sinners (note **σωτηρίας**) and lead the way to glory, could only be proved and acquired through the sufferings involved in living as man, tempted and with death to face. Therefore **διὰ παθημάτων**, "a plurality of sufferings" not merely as in ver. 9 **τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου**. *Cf.* ver. 18. The glory indeed to which this captain of salvation leads is the glory of triumph over temptation and all that tends to terrify and enslave men.

Ver. 11. In the eleventh verse the writer proceeds to explain *wherein* consisted the fittingness (**τὸ πρέπον**) of perfecting the **ἀρχηγόν** through sufferings. It lies in the fact that He and those He leads are brothers. In vv. 11-13 it is shown that this is so, and in the succeeding verses the writer points out what is involved in this brotherhood. **ὁ ἁγιάζων** and **οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι** are to be

k Ps. xxii. 22, 25; 2 Sam. xxii. 3; Ps. xviii. 2.

τες· δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν, 12. k λέγων, "Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε". Καὶ πάλιν, "Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ'

taken as present participles, so usually are, in the timeless substantive sense. **ἁγιάζειν** means (1) to set apart as belonging to God, in contradistinction to **κοινός,** belonging to every one. So in Gen. ii. 3, of the seventh day, and in Exodus of the mountain, the tent, the altar. It is especially used of persons set apart to the priesthood or to any special work (Exod. xxx. 30; Jer. i. 5; John x. 36). Through the O.T. ceremonial the whole people were thus **ἡγιασμένοι,** set apart to God, admitted to His worship. In this Epistle the word is used with much of the O.T. idea cleaving to it, and is often rather equivalent to what we understand by "justify" than to "sanctify". *Cf.* x. 10. It signifies that which enables men to approach God. But (2) it is in N.T. more and more felt that it is only by purification of character men can be set apart for God, so that this higher meaning also attaches to the word. In the present verse **ἁγιάζων** introduces the priestly idea, enlarged upon in ver. 17. **ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες** "all of one". There is much to be said for Calvin's interpretation "of one nature," or Cappellus' "of one common mass". Certainly Bleek's reason for rejecting such renderings—that **ἐξ** can only signify *origin*, is incorrect. "Greek often uses the prepositions of origin (**ἐκ, ἀπό**) when we prefer those of position or direction, as in **ἐξ ἀπροσδοκήτου,** on a sudden, **ἐξ ἀφανοῦς,** in a doubt, **ἐκ μιᾶς χειρός,** with one hand" (Verrall on *Choeph.*, line 70). In N.T. **ἐκ** frequently expresses the party or class to which one belongs (Jo. iii. 31). And *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 17. It might be urged from xi. 12 that this writer had he meant parentage would have said **ἀφ' ἑνός.** Nevertheless the meaning seems to be "of one father". The **πολλοὺς υἱοὺς** of ver. 10, and the **δι' ἣν αἰτίαν** which follows make for this sense. And the argument of ver. 14, that because Christ was brother to men He therefore took flesh, proves that **ἐξ ἑνὸς** cannot mean "of one nature'. The fact that He and they are **ἐξ ἑνὸς** is the ground of His incarnation. He was Son and Brother before appearing on earth. The words then can only mean that the "many sons" who are to be brought to glory and the "Son" who leads them are of one parentage. The sonship in both cases looks to the same Father, and depends on Him and is subject to the same laws of obedience and development. But what Father is meant? Not Adam (Beza, Hofmann, etc.); Weiss argues strongly for Abraham, appealing to ver. 16 and other considerations; but the fact that in ver. 14 the incarnation is treated as a *result* of the brotherhood, seems to involve that we must understand that God is meant; that before the incarnation Christ recognised His brotherhood. "On this account," because His parentage is the same, "He is not ashamed to call them brothers". He might have been expected to shrink from those who had so belied their high origin, or at the best to move among them with the kindly superior professionalism of a surgeon who enters the ward of an hospital solely to heal, not to live there; but He claims men as his kin and on this bases His action (*cf.* xi. 16).

Ver. 12. In proof that He is not ashamed to take his place among men as a brother three passages are adduced from the O.T. in which this relationship is implied. These passages are so confidently assumed to be Messianic that they are quoted as spoken by Christ Himself, **λέγων.** The fact that words of Jesus spoken while He lived on earth are not quoted can scarcely be accepted as proof that the Gospels were not in existence when this Epistle was written, for even after the middle of the second century, the O.T. was still the "Scripture" of the Christian Church. The first quotation is from the twenty-second Psalm applied to Himself by our Lord on the cross. The LXX **διηγήσομαι** is altered to **ἀπαγγελῶ.** The significant words in the first clause are **τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου**; and the significance of the second clause consists in the representation of the Messiah as taking part in the *worship of God* in the congregation. This is one particular form in which His brotherhood manifests itself. For the passages cited not merely affirm the brotherhood, but also exhibit its reality in the participation by the Messiah of human conditions.

Ver. 13. The two quotations cited in the thirteenth verse are from Isa. viii. 17, 18. There they are continuous, here they are separately introduced, each by the

αὐτῷ". 13. [1]Καὶ πάλιν, "Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεός". 14. [m]Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παιδία κεκοινώνηκε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος,[1] καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλησίως μετέσχε τῶν αὐτῶν, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τουτ-

l Esa. viii. 18; Joan. x. 29, et xvii. 6, 9, 11, 12.
m Esa. xxv. 8; Ose. xiii. 14; Joan. i. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55; Phil. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 10.

[1] T.R. in KL, f, vgcle; αιματ. κ. σαρκος in ℵBCDEMP, 17, 37, 47, 137.

usual **καὶ πάλιν**, because they serve to bring out two distinct points. In the first, the Messiah utters his trust in God, and thereby illustrates His sonship and brotherhood with man. Like all men He is dependent on God. As Calvin says: "since He depends on the aid of God His condition has community with ours". In the second part, **ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ** not only calls attention to Himself as closely associated with the **παιδία**; but also, as Weiss thinks, intimates His readiness to obey, as if "Here am I". This obedience He shares with those whom God has committed to His care, God's **παιδία** and His brothers. *Cf.* Jo. vi. 37, 39, xvii. 11.

Vv. 14-16. This saving brotherhood involved incarnation and death. For, as it has ever been the common lot of the **παιδία** to live under the conditions imposed by flesh and blood, subject to inevitable dissolution and the shrinkings and weaknesses consequent, He also, this Son of God, Himself (**καὶ αὐτὸς**) shared with them in their identical nature, thus making Himself liable to death; His intention being that by dying He might render harmless him that used death as a terror, and thus deliver from slavery those who had suffered death to rule their life and lived in perpetual dread. **κεκοινώνηκεν . . . μετέσχεν** perf. and aor.; the one pointing to the common lot which the **παιδία** have always shared, **αἵματος καὶ σαρκός**, usually (but not always, Eph. vi. 12) inverted and denoting human nature in its weakness and liability to decay (Gal. i. 16, etc., and especially 1 Cor. xv. 50); the other, expressing the one act of Christ by which He became a sharer with men in this weak condition. He partook, but does not now partake. [Wetstein quotes from Polyaenus that Chabrias enjoined upon his soldiers when about to engage in battle to think of the enemy as **ἀνθρώποις αἷμα καὶ σάρκα ἔχουσιν καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως ἡμῖν κεκοινωνηκόσι.**] This human nature Christ assumed **παραπλησίως**, which Chrysostom interprets, **οὐ φαντασίᾳ οὐδὲ εἰκόνι ἀλλ' ἀληθείᾳ.** It means not merely "in like manner," but "in absolutely the same manner"; as in Arrian vii. 1, 9, **σὺ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὢν, παραπλήσιος τοῖς ἄλλοις,** Herod. iii. 104, **σχεδὸν παραπλησίως** "almost identical"; see also Diod. Sic., v. 45. **τῶν αὐτῶν,** *i.e.*, blood and flesh. The purpose of the incarnation is expressed in the words **ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου . . . ἦσαν δουλίας.** He took flesh that He might die, and so destroy not death but him that had the power of death, and deliver, etc. The double object may be considered as one, the defeat of the devil involving the deliverance of those in bondage. The means He used to accomplish this object was His dying (**διὰ τ. θανάτου**). How the death of Christ had the result here ascribed to it, we are left to conjecture; for nowhere else in the Epistle is the deliverance of man by Christ's death stated in analogous terms. We must first endeavour to understand the terms here employed. **καταργήσῃ**: "might render inoperative" (**ἄργον**), "bring to nought". Sometimes "destroy" or "put an end to" as in 1 Cor. xv. 26 **ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος. τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου,** "him who has the power of death, that is, the devil," **τὸν διάβολον** (**διαβάλλω**, I set asunder, put at variance) used by LXX to render שָׂטָן in Job i. ii. and Zach. iii., etc.; **Σατάν** is used in 1 Kings xi. In N.T. both designations occur frequently. But the significance for our present passage lies in the description "him who has the power of death". **ἔχειν τὸ κράτος** is classical, and **κράτος** with the genitive denotes the realm within which or over which the rule is exercised, as Herod., iii. 142, **τῆς Σάμου τ. κράτος.** In connection with this universal human experience of death he uses his malign influence, and the striking vision of Zech. iii. shows us how he does

[n] Luc. i. 74; Rom. viii. 15. ἐστι, τὸν διάβολον, 15. [n] καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ τούτους, ὅσοι φόβῳ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας.[1] 16. οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἀγ-

[1] δουλιας in ℵD*E*HP; δουλειας in ABCDb, etc., E**KLM.

so. He brings sins to remembrance, he appears as the accuser of the brethren, as the counsel for the prosecution. Thus he creates a fear of death, a fear which is one of the most marked features of O.T. experience. Both Schoettgen and Weber produce rabbinical sayings which illustrate the power of a legal religion to produce servility and fear, so that the natural expression of the Jew was, "In this life death will not suffer a man to be glad". Life, in short, with sin unaccounted for, and with death viewed as the punishment of sin to look forward to, is a **δουλεία** unworthy of God's sons. This indeed is expressly stated in ver. 15. The **δουλεία** which contradicts the idea of sonship and prevents men from entering upon their destiny of dominion over all things is occasioned by their fear of death (**φόβῳ**, the dative of cause) as that which implies rejection by God. [Among the races whose conscience was not educated by the law, views of death varied greatly. These will be found in Geddes' *Phaedo*, pp. 217, 223; and *cf.* the opening paragraphs of the third Book of the *Republic*, as well as pp. 330 and 486 B. Aristotle with his usual straightforward frankness pronounces death **φοβερώτατον**. On the other hand, many believed **τεθνάμεναι βέλτιον ἢ βίοτος**; Hegesias was styled **ὁ πεισιθάνατος**, and by his persuasions and otherwise suicide became popular; and death was no longer reckoned an everlasting ill, but "portum potius paratum nobis et perfugium". Wholly applicable to the present passage is Spinoza's "homo *liber* de nihilo minus quam de morte cogitat". *Cf.* Philo, *Omn. sap. liber*, who quotes Eurip., **τίς ἐστι δοῦλος τοῦ θανεῖν ἄφροντις ὤν**;] This then was the bondage which characterised the life (**διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν**) of those under the old dispensation; the bondage in which they were held (**ἔνοχοι** = **ἐνεχόμενοι**, "held" or "bound," "subject to," see Thayer, s.v.), and from which Christ delivered **τούτους ὅσοι**, not as if it were a restricted number who were delivered, but on the contrary to mark that the deliverance was coextensive with the bondage. **ἀπαλλάξῃ**, used especially of freeing from slavery [exx. from Philo in Carpzov, and *cf.* Isocrates **οὗτος ἀπήλλαξεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ δέους τούτου**. In the *Phaedo* frequently of soul emancipated from the body.] How the Son wrought this deliverance **διὰ τοῦ θανάτου** can now be answered; and it cannot be better answered than in the words of Robertson Smith: "To break this sway, Jesus takes upon Himself that mortal flesh and blood to whose infirmities the fear of death under the O.T. attaches. But while He passes through all the weakness of fleshly life, and, finally, through death itself, He, unlike all others, proves Himself not only exempt from the fear of death, but victorious over the accuser. To Him, who in His sinlessness experienced every weakness of mortality, without diminution of his unbroken strength of fellowship with God, death is not the dreaded sign of separation from God's grace (*cf.* ver. 7), but a step in his divinely appointed career; not something inflicted on Him against His will, but a means whereby (**διὰ** with genitive) He consciously and designedly accomplishes His vocation as Saviour. For this victory of Jesus over the devil, or, which is the same thing, the fear of death, must be taken, like every other part of His work, in connection with the idea of His vocation as Head and Leader of His people." In short, we see now what is meant by His tasting death "*for every man*," and how this death guarantees the perfect dominion and glory depicted in Psalm viii. All the humiliation and death are justified by the necessities of the case, he concludes, "For, as I need scarcely say, it is not angels (presumably sinless and spiritual beings, **πνεύματα**, i. 14) He is taking in hand, but He is taking in hand Abraham's seed (the dying children of a dead father; 'also dergleichen sterbliche und durch Todesfurcht in Knechtschaft befangene Wesen,' Bleek). **δήπου**: frequently in classics, as Plato, *Protagoras*, 309 C. **οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἐνέτυχες**, "for I may take it for granted you have not met" (*Apol.*, 21 B). **τί ποτε λέγει ὁ θεός . . . φάσκων ἐμὲ σοφώτατον εἶναι; οὐ γὰρ δήπου ψεύδεταί γε**, "for, at any rate, as need hardly be said, he is not saying what is untrue". **ἐπιλαμβάνεται**: "lays hold to help" or simply "succours," with the idea of taking a person up to see him through. *Cf.*

γέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται. 17. ° ὅθεν ὤφειλε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι

° iv. 15, et v. 2; Phil. ii. 7.

Sir., iv. 11. **ἡ σοφία . . . ἐπιλαμβάνεται τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν,** and the Scholiast on Aesch., *Pers.*, 742, **ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις εἰς καλὰ ἢ εἰς κακά, ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπιλαμβάνεται.** Castellio was the first to propose the meaning "help" in place of "assume the nature of," and Beza having urged the latter rendering as being that of the Greek fathers, goes on to say, "quo magis est execranda Castellionis audacia qui **ἐπιλαμ.** convertit '*opitulatur*,' non modo falsa, sed etiam inepta interpretatione, etc.". It has been suggested that **θάνατος** might be the nominative which would give quite a good sense, but as Christ is the subject both of the foregoing and of the succeeding clause it is more likely that this affirmation also is made of Him. It is certainly remarkable that instead of saying "He lays hold of man to help him," the writer should give the restricted **σπέρματος Ἀβ.** Von Soden, who supposes the Epistle is addressed to Gentiles, thinks the writer intends to prepare the way for his introducing the priesthood of Christ, and to exhibit the claim of Christians to the fulfilment of the prophecies made to Abraham (*cf.* Robertson Smith), but this Weiss brands as "eine leere Ausflucht". Perhaps we cannot get further than Estius (cited by Bleek): "gentium vocationem tota hac epistola prudenter dissimulat, sive quod illius mentio Hebraeis parum grata esset, sive quod instituto suo non necessaria". Or, as Bleek says, "es erklärt sich aus dem Zwecke des Briefes".

Ver. 17. **ὅθεν** [six times in this Epistle; not used by Paul, but *cf.* Acts xxvi. 19] 'wherefore," because He makes the seed of Abraham the object of His saving work, **ὤφειλεν,** "He was under obligation". **ὀφείλω** is "used of a necessity imposed either by law and duty, or by reason, or by the times, or by the nature of the matter under consideration" (Thayer). Here it was the nature of the case which imposed the obligation **κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι** "to be made like His brothers in all respects," and therefore, as Chrysostom says, **ἐτέχθη, ἐτράφη, ηὐξήθη, ἔπαθε πάντα ἅπερ ἐχρῆν, τέλος ἀπέθανη.** He must be a real man, and not merely have the appearance of one. He must enter into the necessary human experiences, look at things from the human point of view, take His place in the crowd amidst the ordinary elements of life. **ἵνα** introduces one purpose which this thorough incarnation was to serve. It would put Christ in a position to sympathise with the tempted and thus incline Him to make propitiation for the sins of the people. [**τοῦ λαοῦ,** also a restricted Jewish designation.] The High-Priesthood is here first mentioned, and it is mentioned as an office with which the readers were familiar. The writer does not now enlarge upon the office or work of the Priest, but merely points to one radical necessity imposed by priesthood, "making propitiation for the sins of the people"; and he affirms that in order to do this (**εἰς τὸ**) he must be merciful and faithful. **ἐλεήμων** as well as **πιστὸς** is naturally construed with **ἀρχιερεύς,** and has its root in Exod. xxii. 27, **ἐλεήμων γάρ εἰμι,** the priest must represent the Divine mercy; he must also be **πιστὸς,** primarily to God, as in iii. 2, but thereby faithful to men and to be trusted by them in the region in which he exercises his function, **τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν,** the whole Godward relations of men. The expression is directly connected with **ἀρχιερεύς,** by implication with **πιστὸς,** and it is found in Exod. xviii. 19, **γίνου σὺ τῷ λαῷ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν.** For neat analogies *cf.* Wetstein. **εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι,** "for the purpose of making propitiation," **εἰς** indicating the special purpose to be served by Christ's becoming Priest. **ἱλάσκομαι** (**ἱλάσκω** is not met with), from **ἵλαος,** Attic **ἵλεως** "propitious," "merciful," means "I render propitious to myself". In the classics it is followed by the accusative of the person propitiated, sometimes of the anger felt. In the LXX it occurs twelve times, thrice as the translation of כִּפֶּר. The only instance in which it is followed by an accusative of the sin, as here, is Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 3, **τὰς ἀσεβείας ἡμῶν σὺ ἱλάσῃ.** In the N.T., besides the present passage, it only occurs in Luke xviii. 13, in the passive form **ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ,** *cf.* 2 Kings v. 18. The compound form **ἐξιλάσκομαι,** although it does not occur in N.T., is more frequently used in the LXX than the simple

τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ. 18. [p] ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρα-
σθείς, δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι.

III. 1. [a] ΘΕΝ, ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι,
κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Χρισ-

p iv. 15, 16.
a iv. 14, et vi. 20, et viii. 1, et ix. 11; Rom. xv. 8; Phil. iii. 14.

verb, and from its construction something may be learnt. As in profane Greek, it is followed by an accusative of the person propitiated, as in Gen. xxxii. 20, where Jacob says of Esau **ἐξιλάσομαι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς δώροις κ.τ.λ.**; *Zech.* vii. 2, **ἐξιλάσασθαι τὸν Κύριον,** and viii. 22, **τὸ πρόσωπον Κυρίου,** also Matt. i. 9. It is however also followed by an accusative of the thing on account of which propitiation is needed or which requires by some rite or process to be rendered acceptable to God, as in Ecclus. iii. 3, iii. 30, v. 6, xx. 28, etc., where it is followed by **ἀδικίαν,** and **ἁμαρτίας**; and in Lev. xvi. 16, 20, 33, where it is followed by **τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ θυσιαστήριον,** and in Ezek. xlv. 20 by **τὸν οἶκον.** At least thirty-two times in Leviticus alone it is followed by **περί,** defining the persons for whom propitiation is made, **περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐξιλάσεται ὁ ἱερεύς** or **περὶ πάσης συναγωγῆς,** or **περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν.** In this usage there is apparent a transition from the idea of propitiating God (which still survives in the passive **ἱλάσθητι**) to the idea of exerting some influence on that which was offensive to God and which must be removed or cleansed in order to complete entrance into His favour. In the present passage it is **τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ** which stand in the way of the full expression of God's favour, and upon those therefore the propitiatory influence of Christ is to be exerted. In what manner precisely this is to be accomplished is not yet said. "The present infinitive **ἱλάσκεσθαι** must be noticed. The one (eternal) act of Christ (c. x. 12—14) is here regarded in its continuous present application to men (*cf.* c. v. 1, 2)," Westcott. (See further on **ἱλάσκεσθαι** in Blass, *Gram.*, p. 88; Deissmann's *Neue Bibelstud.*, p. 52; and Westcott's *Epistle of St. John*, pp. 83-85.) **τοῦ λαοῦ** the historical people of God, Abraham's seed; *cf.* Matt. i. 21; Heb. iv. 9, xiii. 12.

Ver. 18. **ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν. . . .** He concludes this part of his argument by explaining the process by which Christ's becoming man has answered the purpose of making Him a merciful and faithful High Priest. The explanation is "non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco". **ἐν ᾧ** is by some interpreters resolved into **ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι** = whereas; by others into **ἐν τούτῳ ὅ** = wherein; the second construction has certainly the ampler warrant, see 1 Pet. ii. 12; Gal. i. 8; Rom. xiv. 22; but the former gives the better sense. It is also contested whether the words mean, that Christ suffered by being tempted, or that He was tempted by His sufferings. Both statements of course are true; but it is not easy to determine which is here intended. Are the temptations the cause of the sufferings, or the sufferings the cause of the temptations? The A.V. and the R.V., also Westcott and others, prefer the former; and from the relation of the participial **πειρασθείς** to the main verb **πέπονθεν,** which naturally indicates the suffering as the result of the temptation, this would seem to be the correct interpretation. Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford and Davidson, however, prefer the other sense, Alford translating: "For He Himself, having been tempted, in that which He hath suffered, He is able to succour them that are (now) tempted". Davidson says: "These sufferings at every point crossed the innocent human instinct to evade them; but being laid on Him by the will of God and in pursuance of His high vocation, they thus became temptations". Dr. Bruce says: "Christ, having experienced temptation to be unfaithful to His vocation in connection with the sufferings arising out of it, is able to succour those who, like the Hebrew Christians, were tempted in similar ways to be unfaithful to their Christian calling". The interpretation has much to recommend it, but as it limits the temptations of Christ to those which arose out of His sufferings, it seems scarcely to fall in so thoroughly with the course of thought, especially with v. 17. **δύναται,** *cf.* iv. 15, v. 2.

CHAPTER III. 1.-CHAPTER IV. 13.—Chapters iii. and iv. as far as ver. 13, form one paragraph. The purpose of the writer in this passage, as in the whole Epistle, is to encourage his readers in their allegiance to Christ and to save them from apostacy by exhibiting Christ as the final mediator. This purpose he has in the first two chapters sought to achieve by compar-

ing Christ with those who previously mediated between God and man,—the prophets who spoke to the fathers, and the angels who mediated the law and were supposed even to regulate nature. He now proceeds to compare Jesus with him round whose name gathered all that revelation and legislation in which the Jew trusted. Moses was the ideal mediator, faithful in *all* God's house. Underlying even the priesthood of Aaron was the word of God to Moses. And yet, free channel of God's will as Moses had been, he was but a servant and in the nature of things could not so perfectly sympathise with and interpret the will of Him whose house and affairs he administered as the Son who Himself was lord of the house.

He therefore bids his readers encourage themselves by the consideration of His trustworthiness, His competence to accomplish all God's will with them and bring them to their appointed rest. But this suggests to him the memorable breakdown of faith in the wilderness generation of Israelites. And he forthwith strengthens his admonition to trust Christ by adding the warning which was so legibly written in the fate of those who left Egypt under the leadership of Moses, but whose faith failed through the greatness of the way. It was not owing to any incompetence or faithlessness in Moses that they died in the wilderness and failed to reach the promised land. It was "because of their unbelief" (iii. 19). Moses was faithful in all God's house, in everything required for the guidance and government of God's people and for the fulfilment of all God's purpose with them: but even with the most trustworthy leader much depends on the follower, and entrance to the fulness of God's blessing may be barred by the unbelief of those who have heard the promise. The promise was not mixed with faith in them to whom it came. But what of those who were led in by Joshua? Even they did not enter into God's rest. That is certain, for long after Joshua's time God renewed His promise, saying "To-day if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts". Entrance into the land, then, did not exhaust the promise of God; there remains over and above that entrance, a rest for the people of God, for "without us," *i.e.*, without the revelation of Christ the fathers were not perfect, their best blessings, such as their land, being but types of better things to come. Therefore let us give diligence to enter into that rest, for the word of God's promise is searching; and, by offering us the best things in fellowship with God, it discloses our real disposition and affinities.

The passage falls into two parts, the former (iii. 1-6) exhibiting the trustworthiness of Christ, the latter (iii. 7-iv. 13) emphasising the unbelief and doom of the wilderness generation.

Ver. 1. **Ὅθεν**, "wherefore," if through Jesus God has spoken His final and saving word (i. 1), thus becoming the Apostle of God, and if the high priest I speak of is so sympathetic and faithful that for the sake of cleansing the people He became man and suffered, then "consider, etc.". The **πιστός** of ver. 17 strikes the keynote of this paragraph. Here for the first time the writer designates his readers, and he does so in a form peculiar to himself (the reading in 1 Thess. v. 27 being doubtful) **ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι**, "Christian brethren," literally "brethren consecrated," separated from the world and dedicated to God. Bleek quotes from Primasius: "Fratres eos vocat tam carne quam spiritu qui ex eodem genere erant". But there is no reason to assign to **ἀδελφοὶ** any other meaning than its usual N T. sense of "fellow-Christians," *cf.* Matt. xxiii. 8. But there is further significance in the additional **κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι**, "partakers of a heavenly calling" (*cf.* **οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας**, ix. 15) suggested by the latent comparison in the writer's mind between the Israelites called to earthly advantages, a land, etc., and his readers whose hopes were fixed on things above. "In the word 'heavenly' there is struck for the first time, in words at least, an antithesis of great importance in the Epistle, that of this world and heaven, in other words, that of the merely material and transient, and the ideal and abiding. The things of the world are material, unreal, transient: those of heaven are ideal, true, eternal. Heaven is the world of realities, of things themselves (ix. 23) of which the things here are but 'copies'" (Davidson). **κατανοήσατε**, "consider," "bring your mind to bear upon," "observe so as to see the significance," as in Luke xii. 24, **κατανοήσατε τοὺς κόρακας**, though it is sometimes, as in Acts xi. 6, xxvii. 39, used in its classical sense "perceive". A "confession" does not always involve that its significance is seen. *Consider* then **τὸν . . . Ἰησοῦν** "the Apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus," the

b ver. 5; Num. xii. 7. c Zach. vi. 12; Matt. xvi. 18.

τὸν [1] Ἰησοῦν· 2. [b] πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν, ὡς καὶ Μωσῆς [2] ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. 3. [c] Πλείονος γὰρ δόξης οὗτος [3] παρὰ Μωσῆν ἠξίωται, καθ' ὅσον πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου ὁ κατασκευάσας

[1] Delete Χριστον with ℵABC*D*MP, 17, 34, 47.
[2] Μωσης in ℵABDEM; Μωυσης in CKLP, 17.
[3] ουτος δοξης in ℵABCDEP; δοξης ουτος KLM.

single article brackets the two designations and Bengel gives their sense: "τὸν ἀποστ. eum qui Dei causam apud nos agit. τὸν ἀρχ. qui causam nostram apud Deum agit". These two functions embrace not the whole of Christ's work, but all that He did on earth (*cf.* i. 1-4). The frequent use of ἀποστέλλειν by our Lord to denote the Father's mission of the Son authorises the present application of **ἀπόστολος**. It is through Him God has spoken (i. 1). Moses is never called **ἀπόστολος** (a word indeed which occurs only once in LXX) though in Exod. iii. 10 God says **ἀποστείλω σε πρὸς Φαραώ**. Schoettgen quotes passages from the Talmud in which the high priest is termed the Apostle or messenger of God and of the Sanhedrim, but this is here irrelevant. **καὶ ἀρχιερέα**, a title which, as applicable to Jesus, the writer explains in chaps. v.-viii. **τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν**, "of our confession," or, whom we, in distinction from men of other faiths, confess; chiefly no doubt in distinction from the non-Christian Jews. **ὁμολογία**, as the etymology shows, means "of one speech with," hence that in which men agree as their common creed, their *confession*, see ref. As Peake remarks: "If this means profession of faith, then 'the readers already confess Jesus as high priest, and this is not a truth taught them in this Epistle for the first time'." [Carpzov quotes from Philo (*De Somn.*): **ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας Ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας**, but here another sense is intended.] **Ἰησοῦν** is added to preclude the possibility of error. **Ἰησοῦς** occurs in this Epistle nine times by itself, thrice with **Χριστός**.

Ver. 2. The characteristic, or particular, qualification of Jesus which is to hold their attention is His trustworthiness or fidelity. **πιστὸν ὄντα** might be rendered "as being faithful". The fidelity here in view, though indirectly to men and encouraging them to trust, is directly to Him who made Him, *sc.*, Apostle and High Priest. **τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν**. The objection urged by Bleek, Lünemann and Alford that **ποιεῖν** can mean "appoint" only when followed by two accusatives is not valid. The second accusative may be understood; and in 1 Sam. xii. 6 we find **Κύριος ὁ ποιήσας τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Ἀαρών**, words which may have been in the writer's mind. The Arian translation, "to Him that created Him," is out of place. Appointment to office finds its correlative in faithfulness, creation scarcely suggests that idea. The fidelity of Jesus is illustrated not by incidents from His life nor by the crowning proof given in His death, nor is it argued from the admitted perfections of His character, but in accordance with the plan of the Epistle it is merely compared to that of Moses, and its superiority is implied in the superiority of the Son to the servant. He was faithful "as also Moses in all His house," this being the crowning instance of fidelity testified to by God Himself, **ὁ θεράπων μου Μωυσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστι** (Num. xii. 7), where the context throws the emphasis on **ὅλῳ**. "The 'house of God' is the organised society in which He dwells" (Westcott), *cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 15. Weiss says that the words **ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ** "necessarily belong" to **πιστὸν ὄντα**. This is questionable, because the writer's point is that Jesus is faithful not "in" but "over" the house of God (ver. 6).

Ver 3. The reason is now assigned why Jesus and His fidelity should eclipse in their consideration that of Moses. The reason is that "this man" (**οὗτος**, "the person who is the subject of our consideration") "has been and is deemed worthy of greater glory ('amplioris gloriae,' Vulg. **πλείονος**, qualitative as in xi. 4) than Moses, in proportion as he that built the house has more honour than the house." The genitive follows the comparative **πλείονα**. The "greater glory" is seen in the more important place occupied by Him in the fulfilment of God's purpose of salvation. This glory of Jesus is as much greater than that of Moses, as the cause is greater than the effect, the builder than the house. [The principle is stated by Philo (*De Plant.*,

αὐτόν· 4. [d] πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος κατασκευάζεται ὑπό τινος· ὁ δὲ τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσας, Θεός. 5. [e] καὶ Μωσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ

d 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. ii. 10.
e ver. 2; Deut. xviii. 15, 18.

c. 16. In Wendland's ed., ii. 147) **ὁ κτησάμενος τὸ κτῆμα τοῦ κτήματος ἀμείνων καὶ τὸ πεποιηκὸς τοῦ γεγονότος,** and by Menander and other comic poets as quoted by Justin (*Apol.*, i. 20) **μείζονα τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦ σκευαζομένου.** Weiss, however, is of opinion that it is not a general principle that is being stated, but that **τοῦ οἴκου** refers directly to the house of God.] **ὁ κατασκευάσας** includes all that belongs to the completion of a house, from its inception and plan in the mind of the architect to its building and furnishing and filling with a household. Originally the word means to equip or furnish, **κατασκενάζειν τὴν οἰκίαν τοῖς σκεύεσιν,** Diog. L. v. 14. So **συμπόσιον κατασ.** Plato, *Rep.*, 363 C. **σκεύεσιν ἰδίοις τὴν ναῦν κατεσκεύασα,** Demosth., *Polyc.*, 1208. Thence, like our word "furnish" or "prepare," it took the wider meaning of "making" or "building" or "providing". Thus the shipbuilder **κατασκ.** the ship; the mason **κατασ.** the tower. So in Heb. xi. 7 **κατεσκεύασε κιβωτόν,** *cf.* 1 Peter iii. 20. (Further, see Stephanus and Bleek). In the present verse it has its most comprehensive meaning, and includes the planning, building, and filling of the house with furniture and with a household. The household is more directly in view than the house. The argument involves that Jesus is identified with the builder of the house, while Moses is considered a part of the house. It is the Son (who in those last Days has spoken God's word to men through the lips of Jesus), who in former times also fulfilled God's purpose by building His house and creating for Him a people. And lest the readers of the epistle should object that Moses was as much the builder of the old as Jesus of the new, the writer lifts their mind from the management of the system or Church to the creation of it.

Ver. 4. **πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος . . . θεός.** "For every house *is built* by someone, but he that built all is God." Over and above the right conduct of the house there is a builder. No house, no religious system, grows of itself; it has a cause in the will of one who is greater than it. There is a "someone" at the root of all that appears in history. And He who planned and brought into being **πάντα,** "all," whether old or new, is God. The present development of this divine house as well as its past condition and equipment is of God. And Christ, the Son, naturally and perfectly representing God or the builder, and by whose agency God created all things (i. 2) is therefore worthy of more honour than Moses. The argument is not so much elliptical as incomplete, waiting to be supplemented by the following verses in which the relation of Jesus to God and the relation of Moses to the house are exhibited. "It is argued that a household must be established by a householder; now God established the universe, and therefore he is the supreme householder of the universal household or Church of God, and in that household Jesus, as His perfect representative, is entitled to receive glory corresponding" (Rendall).

Ver. 5. **καὶ Μωϋσῆς. . . .** Another reason for expecting to find fidelity in Jesus and for ascribing to Him greater glory. Moses was faithful as a servant *in* the house (**ἐν**), Christ as a Son *over* (**ἐπὶ**) his house. **θεράπων** denotes a free servant in an honourable position and is the word applied to Moses in Num. xii. 7. ["Apud Homerum nomen est non servile sed ministros significat voluntarios, nec raro de viris dicitur nobili genere natis" (Stephanus). It is especially used of those who serve the gods. See Pindar *Olymp.* iii. 29.] Both the fidelity and the inferior position of Moses are indicated in the words which occur like a refrain in Exodus: "According to all that the Lord commanded, so did he". Nothing was left to his own initiative; he had to be instructed and commanded; but all that was entrusted to him, he executed with absolute exactness. The crowning proof of his fidelity was given in the extraordinary scene (Exod. xxxvii.), where Moses refused to be "made a great nation" in room of Israel. He is said to have been faithful **εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων.** The meaning is, the testimony to his faithfulness which God had pronounced was the guarantee of the trustworthiness of the report he gave of what the Lord afterwards spoke to him. This meaning seems to be determined by the context in Numbers xii. "My servant Moses

f Matt. xxiv. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 16, et vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21, 22. 1 Tim. iii. 15; 1 Peter ii. 5.

αὐτοῦ, ὡς θεράπων, εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων· 6. [f] Χριστὸς δὲ, ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, οὗ[1] οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἐάνπερ[2] τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν[3] κατάσχωμεν. 7. [g] Διὸ, καθὼς λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, "Σήμερον

g ver. 15, et iv. 7; Ps. xlv. 7.

[1] T.R. in ℵABC; ος in D*M, 6, 67** d, e, f, Vulg. (quae domus sumus nos).

[2] T.R. in ℵ[c]ACD[c]E**KL; εαν in ℵ*BDE*MP, 17, d, e, f, Vulg.

[3] WH bracket μεχρι τελους βεβαιαν and Weiss rejects the words with B. All the other great uncials insert the words. Bleek thinks them genuine.

. . . is faithful in all my house. I *will speak to him* mouth to mouth, apparently and not in dark speeches." Grotius says "ut pronuntiaret populo ea quae Deus ei dicenda quoquo tempore mandabat". Bleek and Davidson refer the μαρτύριον to Moses not to God. "He was a servant *for a testimony, i.e.*, to bear testimony of those things which were to be spoken, *i.e.*, from time to time revealed. Reference might be made to Barnabas viii. 3, εἰς μαρτ. τῶν φυλῶν. The meaning advocated by Calvin, Delitzsch, Westcott and others is attractive. They understand the words as referring to the things which were to be spoken by Christ, and that the whole of Moses' work was for a testimony of those things. Thus Westcott translates "for a testimony of the things which should be spoken by God through the prophets and finally through Christ". This gives a fine range to the words, but the context in Numbers is decisively against it. The idea seems to be that Moses being but a θεράπων needed a testimonial to his fidelity that the people might trust him; and also that he had no initiative but could only report to the people the words that God might speak to him. In contrast to this position of Moses, Χριστὸς ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, Christ's fidelity was that of "a Son over his house". It was not the fidelity which exactly performs what another commands and faithfully enters into and fulfils His will. It is the fidelity of one who himself is possessed by the same love and conceives the same purposes as the Father. The interests of the house and the family are the Son's interests. "We are His house" and in Christ we see that the interests of God and man, of the Father and the family are one. [Grotius quotes the jurisconsults: "etiam vivente patre filium quodam modo dominum esse rerum paternarum".] But this house so faithfully administered by the Son Himself is the body of Christian people, οὗ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, we are those on whom this fidelity is spent. The relative finds its antecedent in αὐτοῦ. The "house of God" is, in the Gospels, the Temple; but in 1 Pet. iv. 17 and 1 Tim. iii. 15 it has the same meaning as here, the people or Church of God. "Whose house are we," but with a condition ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν . . . κατάσχωμεν, "if we shall have held fast our confidence and the glorying of our hope firm to the end". For, as throughout the Epistle, so here, all turns on perseverance. παρρησία originally "frank speech," hence the boldness which prompts it. *Cf.* iv. 16, x. 19, 35; so in Paul and John. καύχημα, not as the form of the word might indicate, "the object of boasting," but the disposition as in 1 Cor. v. 6: οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν and 2 Cor. v. 12: ἀφορμὴν διδόντες ὑμῖν καυχήματος. [*Cf.* the interchange of βρῶσις and βρῶμα in Jo. iv. 32, 34, and Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gram.*, 1021 and 1155.] Whether ἐλπίδος belongs to both substantives is doubtful. The Christian's hope of a heavenly inheritance (ver. 1), of perfected fellowship with God, should be so sure that it confidently proclaims itself, and instead of being shamefaced glories in the future it anticipates. And this attitude must be maintained μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν, until difficulty and trial are past and hope has become possession. βεβαίαν In agreement with the remoter substantive, which might give some colour to the idea that the expression was lifted from ver. 14 and inserted here; but Bleek shows by several instances that the construction is legitimate.

CHAPTER III. 7—IV. 13. The great instance in history of the disaster which attends failure of faith is adduced as a warning to the faltering Hebrews.

Διὸ, "wherefore," since it is only by holding fast our confidence to the end,

ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, 8. [h] μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, 9. οὗ ἐπείρασάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, ἐδοκίμασάν με,[1] καὶ

[h] Exod. xvii. 2; Num. xx. 13.

[1] T.R.אcDcKL al pler, f, vg.; εν δοκιμασια with א*ABCD*EMP, 17, 73, 137.

that we continue to be the house of Christ and enjoy His faithful oversight, *cf.* ver. 14. **Διὸ** was probably intended to be immediately followed by **βλέπετε** (ver. 12) "wherefore take heed," but a quotation is introduced from Ps. xcv. which powerfully enforces the **βλέπετε.** Or it may be that **διὸ** connects with **μὴ σκληρύνητε,** but the judicious bracketing of the quotation by the A.V. is to be preferred. The quotation is introduced by words which lend weight to it, **καθὼς λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,** a form of citation not found elsewhere in exactly the same terms, but in x. 15 we find the similar form **μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγ.** *Cf.* also ix. 8. Agabus uses it of his own words (Acts xxi. 11). In 1 Tim. iv. 1 we have **τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει** *cf.* Rev. ii.-iii. "It is characteristic of the Epistle that the words of Holy Scripture are referred to the Divine Author, not to the human instrument" (Westcott). The Psalm (95) is ascribed to David in iv. 7 as in the LXX it is called **αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δανίδ,** although in the Hebrew it is not so ascribed. The quotation contains vv. 7-11.

Σήμερον, "to-day" is in the first instance, the "to-day" present to the writer of the psalm, and expresses the thought that God's offers had not been withdrawn although rejected by those to whom they had long ago been made. But Delitzsch adduces passages which show that **σήμερον** in this psalm was understood by the synagogue to refer to the second great day of redemption. "The history of redemption knows but of two great turning points, that of the first covenant and that of the new" (Davidson). And what the writer to the Hebrews fears is that the second announcement of promise may be disregarded as the first. Force is lent to his fears by the fact that the forty years of the Messiah's waiting from 30-70 A.D., when Jerusalem was to be destroyed, were fast running out. The fate of the exasperating Israelites in the wilderness received an ominous significance in presence of the obduracy of the generation which had heard the voice of Christ Himself.

ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, "if ye shall hear His voice" (R.V., Vaughan); not "if ye will hearken to His voice." The sense is, "If God should be pleased, after so much inattention on our part, to speak again, see that ye give heed to Him".

Ver. 8. **μὴ σκληρύνητε,** the prohibitory subjunctive, *v.* Burton, p. 162. "The figure is from the stiffening by cold or disease, of what ought to be supple and pliable" (Vaughan). [The verb occurs first in Hippocrates, *cf. Anz.* 342.] It is ascribed to **τὸν τράχηλον** (Deut. x. 16), **τὸν νῶτον** (2 Kings xvii. 14), **τὴν καρδίαν** (Exod. iv. 21), **τὸ πνεῦμα** (Deut. ii. 30). Sometimes the hardening is referred to the man, sometimes it is God who inflicts the hardening as a punishment. Here the possible hardening is spoken of as if the human subject could prevent it. **τὰς καρδίας,** the whole inner man. **ὡς ἐν τῷ . . ἐρήμῳ.** This stands in the psalm as the translation of the Hebrew which might be rendered: ["Harden not your hearts] as at *Meribah,* as on the day of *Massah* in the wilderness," Meribah being representedby **παραπικρασμός** and Massah by **πειρασμός.** The tempting of God by Israel in the wilderness is recorded in Exod. xvii. 1-7, where the place is called "Massah and Meribah". This occurred in the first year of the wanderings. **παραπικρασμός** is found only in this psalm (although **παραπικραίνειν** is frequent) its place being taken by **λοιδόρησις** in Exod. xvii. 7 and by **ἀντιλογία** in Num. xx. 12. It means "embitterment," "exacerbation," "exasperation". **κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν** is rendered by the Vulgate "secundum diem," rightly. It means "after the manner of the day". Westcott, however, prefers the temporal sense.

Ver. 9. **οὗ ἐπείρασάν με . . .,** "where your fathers tempted me," *i.e.,* in the wilderness. Others take **οὗ** as = "with which," attracted into genitive by **πειρασμοῦ. ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ,** "in pntting me to the proof". **καὶ εἶδον . . . ἔτη,** "and saw my works forty years," the wonders of mercy and of judgment. In the psalm **τεσσ. ἔτη** are joined to **προσώχθισα, διὸ** being omitted. The same connection is adopted in ver. 17.

εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη· 10. διὸ προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ εἶπον, Ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ· αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ
i Num. xiv. 21; Deut. i. 34. ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδούς μου· 11. [i] ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου." 12. βλέπετε, ἀδελφοί, μή ποτε ἔσται ἔν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας, ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ζῶντος· 13. ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν,

Ver. 10. **διὸ προσώχθισα**, "wherefore I was greatly displeased". In the psalm the Hebrew verb means "I loathed," elsewhere in the LXX it translates verbs meaning "I am disgusted with," "I spue out," "I abhor," *cf.* Lev. xxvi. 30, [from ὄχθη a bank, as if from a river chafing with its banks; or related to ἄχθος and ἄχθομαι as if "burdened".]

αὐτοὶ δὲ. . . . The insertion of **αὐτοὶ δὲ** shows that this clause is not under **εἶπον**, but is joined with the preceding **προσώχθ.** "I was highly displeased,—but yet they did not recognise my ways."

Ver. 11. **ὡς ὤμοσα.** "As I sware," *i.e.*, justifying my oath to exclude them from the land. **εἰ εἰσελεύσονται**, the common form of oath with **εἰ** which supposes that some such words as "God do so to me and more also" have preceded the "if". The oath quoted in Ps. xcv. is recorded in Num. xiv. 21-23. **εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου**, "into my rest," primarily, the rest in Canaan, but see on chap. iv.

Ver. 12. **Βλέπετε ἀδελφοὶ μήποτε. . . .** "Take heed lest haply" as in xii. 25, Col. ii. 8, for the more classical **ὁρᾶτε μὴ**. It is here followed by a future indicative as sometimes in classics. **ἔν τινι ὑμῶν**, the individualising, as in ver. 13 indicates the writer's earnestness, whether, as Bleek supposes, it means that the whole Christian community of the place is to be watchful for the individual, may be doubted; although this idea is confirmed by the **παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς** of ver. 13. What they are to be on their guard against is the emergence of **καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν . . . ζῶντος**, a wicked heart of unbelief manifesting itself in departing from Him who is a living God. **ἀπιστίας** is the genitive of quality = a bad, unbelieving heart; whether the wickedness proceeds from the unbelief, or the unbelief from the wickedness, is not determined. Although, from the next verse it might be gathered that unbelief is considered the result of allowed sin: *i.e.*, it is when the heart is hardened through sin, it becomes unbelieving, so that the psychological order might be stated thus: sin, a deceived mind, a hardened heart, unbelief, apostasy. The main idea in the writer's mind is that unbelief in God's renewed offer of salvation is accompanied by and means apostasy from the living God. In the O.T. Jehovah is called "the living God" in contrast to lifeless impotent idols, and the designation is suggestive of His power to observe, visit, judge and succour His people. In this Epistle it occurs, ix. 14, x. 31, xii. 22. To object that the apostasy of Jews from Christianity could not be called "apostacy from God" is to mistake. The very point the writer wishes to make is just this: Remember that to apostatize from Christ in whom you have found God, is to apostatize from God. It is one of the ominous facts of Christian experience that any falling away from high attainment sinks us much deeper than our original starting point.

Ver. 13. To avoid this, **παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν**, "Exhort one another daily". **ἑαυτούς** is equivalent to **ἀλλήλους**, see Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13. **ἄχρις οὗ τὸ Σήμερον καλεῖται**, "as long as that period endures which can be called 'to-day'". **ἄχρις** denotes a point up to which something is done; hence, the term during which something is done as here. **τὸ σήμερον** = the word "to-day". Bengel says, "Dum Psalmus iste auditur et legitur"; but this is less likely. The meaning is, So long as opportunity is given to hear God's call. **ἵνα μὴ . . . ἁμαρτίας**, "lest any of you be rendered rebellious through sin's deceit"; perhaps the meaning would be better brought out by translating "lest any of you be rendered rebellious by sin's deceit". [On sin's deceit *cf.* "Nemo repente pessimus evasit"; and the striking motto to the 35th chap. of *The Fortunes of Nigel*.] Sin in heart or life blinds a man to the significance and attractiveness of God's offer.

Ver. 14. **μέτοχοι γὰρ. . . .** In ver. 6 the writer had adduced as the reason of his warning (**βλέπετε**) that participation

ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτῃ
τῆς ἁμαρτίας· 14. [k] μέτοχοι γὰρ γεγόναμεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐάνπερ [k] Rom. viii.
τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, 15. [17.]
[l] ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, "Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκλη- [l] ver. 7.
ρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ". 16. Τινὲς [1] γὰρ
ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου

[1] T.R. with LMP, 37; τίνες in agreement with τίσι of vv. 17, 18; and with the sense. See Bengel in loc.

in the salvation of Christ depended on continuance in the confident expectation that their heavenly calling would be fulfilled; and so impressed is he with the difficulty of thus continuing that he now returns to the same thought, and once again assigns the same reason for his warning: "For we are become partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence firm to the end". Delitzsch, Rendall, Bruce and others understand by **μέτοχοι**, "partners" or "fellows" of Christ, as if the faithful were not only the house of Christ (ver. 6) but shared His joy in the house. It may be objected that **μέτοχοι** in this Epistle (ii. 14, iii. 1, v. 13, vi. 4, vii. 13, xii. 8) is regularly used of participators in something, not of participators with someone. In i. 9, however, it is not so used. The idea of participating with Christ finds frequent expression in Scripture. See Matt. xxv. 21; Rev. iii. 21. **τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, the article may link this mention of Christ's name with that in ver. 6; and, if so, **μέτοχοι** will naturally refer to companionship with Christ in His house. This companionship we have entered into and continue to enjoy [**γεγόναμεν**] on the same condition as above (ver. 6) **ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν...** "if at least we maintain the beginning of our confidence firm to the end". **ὑποστάσεως** is used by LXX twenty times and represents twelve different Hebrew words [Hatch in *Essays in Bibl. Greek* says eighteen times representing fifteen different words, but *cf. Concordance*]. In Ruth i. 12, Ps. xxxix. 8, Ezek. xix. 5 it means "ground of hope" [its primary meaning being that on which anything is based], hence it takes the sense, "hope" or "confidence". Bleek gives examples of its use in later Greek, Polyb., iv. 50, **οἱ δὲ Ῥόδιοι θεωροῦντες τὴν τῶν Βυζαντίων ὑπόστασιν**, so vi. 55 of Horatius guarding the bridge. It also occurs in the sense of "fortitude," bearing up against pain, *v.* Diod. Sic., *De Virt.*, p. 557, and Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii. 1. Confidence the Hebrews already possessed [**ἀρχὴν**]; their test was its maintenance to the end [**τέλους**], *i.e.*, till it was beyond trial, finally triumphant, in Christ's presence.

Ver. 15. **ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι. . .** "While it is said to-day, etc." The construction of these words is debated. Bleek, Delitzsch, von Soden and others construe them with what follows, beginning at this point a fresh paragraph. The meaning would thus be: "Since it is said, 'To-day if ye hear his voice, harden not, etc.,' who are meant, who were they who heard and provoked?" This is inviting but the **γὰρ** of ver. 16 is decidedly against it. Davidson connects **ἐν τῷ λεγ.** with what immediately precedes: "'if we hold fast . . . unto the end, while it is said,' *i.e.*, not *during* the time that it is said, but in the presence and consciousness of the saying, Harden not, etc. . . . with this divine warning always in the ears". Similarly Weiss. Westcott connects the words with ver. 13, making 14 parenthetical. Either of these constructions is feasible. It is also possible to let the sentence stand by itself as introductory to what follows, taking **μὴ σκληρ.** as directly addressed to the Hebrews, not as merely completing the quotation: "While it is being said To-day if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation". The **λέγεσθαι** thus contains only the clause ending with **ἀκούσητε.**

Ver. 16. **τίνες γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν:** "For who were they who after hearing provoked?" He proceeds further to enforce his warning that confidence begun is not enough, by showing that they who provoked God and fell in the wilderness had begun a life of faith and begun it well. For the answer to his question is "Nay did not all who came out of Egypt with Moses?" They were not exceptional sinners who fell away, but all who came out of Egypt,

διὰ Μωσέως. 17. [m]τίσι δὲ προσώχθισε τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη; οὐχὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασιν, ὧν τὰ κῶλα ἔπεσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; 18. [n]τίσι δὲ ὤμοσε μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι; 19. καὶ βλέπομεν ὅτι οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν εἰσελθεῖν δι' ἀπιστίαν. IV. 1. Φοβηθῶμεν οὖν μή ποτε καταλειπομένης [1] ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, δοκῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν

m Num. xiv. 22, 37, et xxvi. 65. Ps. cvi. 26; 1 Cor. x. 5, etc., Judæ v.
n Num. xiv. 30, Deut. i. 34, 35.

[1] T.R. ABCDᶜKLMP; καταλιπομενης ℵD*.

the whole mass of the gloriously rescued people whose faith had carried them through between the threatening walls of water and over whom Miriam sang her triumphal ode. **ἀλλά** adds force to the answer, as if it were said, It is asked *who* provoked, as though it were some only, *but* was it not *all?* **πάντες**, for it is needless excepting Joshua and Caleb.

Ver. 17. **τίσι δὲ προσώχθισε. . . .** "And with whom was He angry forty years?" taking up the next clause of the Psalm, v. 10. Again the question is answered by another "Was it not with them that sinned?" [**ἁμαρτήσασιν**: "This is the only form of the aorist participle in N.T. In the moods the form of **ἥμαρτον** is always used except Matt. xviii. 15, Luke xvii. 4, **ἁμαρτήσῃ**: Rom. vi. 15." Westcott, *cf.* Blass, p. 43.] It was not caprice on God's part, nor inability to carry them to the promised land. It was because they sinned [see esp. Num. xxxii. 23] that their "carcases fell in the wilderness". **ὧν τὰ κῶλα ἔπεσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.** These words are taken from Num. xiv. 29, 32, where God utters the doom of the wilderness generation. **κῶλον**, a limb or member of the body [Æsch., *Prom.*, 81; Soph., *O.C.*, 19, etc.]; hence a clause of a sentence (and in English, the point which marks it). Used by the LXX to translate פֶּגֶר, cadaver. Setting out from Egypt with the utmost confidence, they left their bones in the desert in unnamed and forgotten graves; not because of their weakness nor because God had failed them but because of their sin.

Ver. 18. **τίσι δὲ ὤμοσε. . . .** "And to whom swore He that they should not enter into His rest, but to them that obeyed not?" The real cause of their exclusion from the rest prepared for them was their disobedience. *Cf.* especially the scene recorded in Num. xiv. where Moses declares that as **ἀπειθοῦντες Κυρίῳ** they were excluded from the land. At the root of their disobedience was unbelief.

Ver. 19. They did not believe God could bring them into the promised land in the face of powerful opposition and so they would not attempt its conquest when commanded to go forward. They were rendered weak by their unbelief. This is pointed out in the concluding words **καὶ βλέπομεν . . .** where the emphasis is on **οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν,** they were not able to enter in, the reason being given in the words **δι' ἀπιστίαν.** The application to the Hebrew Christians was sufficiently obvious. They were in danger of shrinking from further conflict and so losing all they had won. They had begun well but were now being weakened and prevented from completing their victory; and this weakness was the result of their not trusting God and their leader.

Between chapters iii. and iv. there is no break. The unbelief of the wilderness generation is held up as a warning, and its use in this respect is justified by the fact that the promise made to them is still made, and is a "living" word which reveals the inmost purposes of the heart and is inevitable in its judgment.

Ver. 1. **φοβηθῶμεν οὖν,** "let us then fear," the writer speaks in the name of the living generation, "lest haply, there being left behind and still remaining a promise to enter [**ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν**; *cf.* **ὥρα ἀπιέναι**, Plato, *Apol.*, p. 42] into His (*i.e.*, God's) rest, any of you (not **ἡμῶν**) should fancy that he has come too late for it; **δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι.** Of these words there are three linguistically possible translations.

1. Should seem to have fallen short.

2. Should be judged to have fallen short.

3. Should think that he has fallen short or come too late.

The argument of the passage favours the third reading, for it aims at strengthening the belief that the promise does remain and that the readers are not born too late to enjoy it. "Gloomy imaginations of failure were rife among the Hebrews" (Rendall). These perse-

ὑστερηκέναι. 2. καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι, καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι· ἀλλ' οὐκ ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους, μὴ συγκεκραμένος[1] τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. 3. [a]εἰσερχόμεθα[2] γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατά- a Ps. xcv. 11.
παυσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες, καθὼς εἴρηκεν, "Ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου,
Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου," καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ
καταβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων. 4. [b]Εἴρηκε γάρ που περὶ τῆς b Gen. ii. 2; Exod. xx. 11, et xxxi. 17.
ἑβδόμης οὕτω, "Καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ
πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ"· 5. καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν, "Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται
εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου". 6. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεταί τινας εἰσελθεῖν
εἰς αὐτὴν, καὶ οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες οὐκ εἰσῆλθον δι' ἀπείθειαν,

[1] T.R. 31, 41, 114, d, e, vg.cle [συγκεκερασμενος in ℵ exegetisch allein haltbar (Weiss)]; συγκεκερασμενους in ABCD*M, Theod.-Mops.; συγκεκραμενους DcEKLP.

[2] T.R. in ℵBDEKLMP, d, e; εισερχωμεθα in AC, 17, 37* f, vg., Primas.

cuted Christians who had expected to find the fulfilment of all promise in Christ, found it hard to believe that "rest" was attainable in Him. The writer proceeds therefore to prove that this promise is left and is still open. καὶγάρ ἐσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι. . . . "For indeed we, even as also they, have had a gospel preached to us." We should have expected an expressed ἡμεῖς, but its suppression shows us that the writer wishes to emphasise εὐηγγελ. To us as to them *it is a gospel* that is preached; and the καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι, "even as they also had," brings out the fact that under the promise of a land in which to rest, the Israelites who came out of Egypt were brought in contact with the redeeming grace and favour of God. The expression reflects significant light on the inner meaning of all God's guidance of Israel's history. They received this rich promise laden with God's intention to bless them, "but the word which they heard did them no good, because in those who heard, it was not mixed with faith". [For συγκεκ. see the *Phaedo*, p. 95A. The accusative is best attested (see critical note), but the sense "not mixed by faith with those who heard," *i.e.*, Caleb and Joshua, is most improbable.] Belief, then, is everything. In proof of which our own experience may be cited: "For we are entering into the rest, we who have believed". This clause confirms both the statements of the previous verse: "we have the promise as well as they," *for* we *are entering* into the rest [note the emphatic position of εἰσερχόμεθα]; and "the word failed them because of their lack of faith," *for* it is our faith [οἱ πιστεύσαντες] which is carrying us into the rest. This fact that we are entering in by faith is in accordance with the utterance quoted already in iii. 11, καθὼς εἴρηκεν, Ὡς ὤμοσα . . . "I sware in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest, although the works were finished from the foundation of the world". This quotation confirms the first clause of the verse, because it proves two things: first, that God had a rest, and second, that He intended that man should rest with Him, because it was "in His wrath," justly excited against the unbelieving (*cf.* iii. 9, 10), that He sware they should not enter in. Had it not been God's original purpose and desire that men should enter into His rest, it could not be said that "in wrath" He excluded some. Their failure to secure rest was not due to the non-existence of any rest, for God's works were finished when the world was founded. This again is confirmed by Scripture, εἴρηκεν γάρ που, *viz.*, in Gen. ii. 2 (*cf.* Exod. xx. 11, xxxi. 17), where it is said that after the six days of creation God rested on the seventh day from all His works. That God has a rest is also stated in the ninety-fifth Psalm, for these words "they shall not enter into my rest" prove that God had a rest. The emphasis in this second quotation (ver. 5) is on the word μοι.

Ver. 6. The writer now, in vv. 6-9, gathers up the argument, and reaches his conclusion that a Sabbatism remains for God's people. The argument briefly is, God has provided a rest for men and has promised it to them. This promise was

c iii. 7, 15; Ps. xcv. 7. 7. [c] πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν, "Σήμερον," ἐν Δαβὶδ λέγων, μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον· καθὼς εἴρηται,[1] "Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν". 8. Εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας· 9. ἄρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 10. ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν

[1] προειρηται in ℵACD*E*P, d, e, f, vg., Copt., Arm.; ειρηται in DcE**KL.

not believed by those who formerly heard it, neither was it exhausted in the bringing in of the people to Canaan. For had it been so, it could not have been renewed long after, as it was. It remains, therefore, to be now enjoyed. "Since, therefore, it remains that some enter into it and those who formerly heard the good news of the promise did not enter, owing to disobedience." **ἀπολείπεται,** there remains over as not yet fulfilled. In v. 9. **σαββατ.** is the nominative, here **τινας εἰσελθεῖν** might be considered a nominative but it is better, with Viteau (256), to construe it as an impersonal verb followed by an infinitive. From the fact that the offer of the rest had been made, or the promise given, "it remains" that some (must) enter in. But a second fact also forms a premiss in the argument. *viz.*: that those to whom the promise had formerly been made did not enter in; therefore, over and above and long after (**μετὰ τοσ. χρόνον**) the original proclamation of this gospel of rest, even in David's time, again (**πάλιν**), God appoints or specifies a certain day (**τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν**) saying "To-day". This proves that the offer is yet open, that the promise holds good in David's time. The words already quoted (**καθὼς προείρηται**) from the 95th Psalm prove this, for they run, "To-day, if ye hear His voice," etc. They prove at any rate that the gospel of rest was not exhausted by the entrance into Canaan under Joshua, "for if Joshua had given them rest, God would not after this speak of another day". The writer takes for granted that the "To-day" of the Psalm extends to Christian times, whether be cause of the life (ver. 12) that is in the word of promise, or because the reference in the Psalm is Messianic. "This 'voice' of God which is 'heard' is His voice speaking to us in His Son (i. 1) and this 'To-day' is 'the end of these days' in which He has spoken to us in Him, on to the time when He shall come again (iii. 13). In effect God has been 'heard' speaking only twice, to Israel and to us, and what He has spoken to both has been the same,—the promise of entering into His rest. Israel came short of it through unbelief; we do enter into the rest who believe (iv. 3)" (Davidson). At all events, the conclusion unhesitatingly follows: "Therefore there remains a Sabbath-Rest for the people of God". **ἄρα** though often standing first in a sentence in N.T. cannot in classical Greek occupy that place. **Σαββατισμός,** though found here only in Biblical Greek, occurs in Plutarch (*De Superstit*, c. 3). The verb **σαββατίζειν** occurs in Exod. xvi. 30 and other places. The word is here employed in preference to **κατάπαυσις** in order to identify the rest promised to God's people with the rest enjoyed by God Himself on the Sabbath or Seventh Day. [So Theophylact, **ἑρμηνεύει πῶς σαββατ. ὠνόμασε τὴν τοιαύτην κατάπαυσιν· διότι, φησὶ, καταπαύομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἡμετέρων, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ θεός, καταπαύσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν εἰς σύστασιν τοῦ κόσμου, σάββατον τὴν ἡμέραν ὠνόμασεν.**] To explain and justify the introduction of this word, the writer adds **ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν . . .** as if he said, I call it a Sabbatism, because it is not an ordinary rest, but one which finds its ideal and actual fulfilment in God's own rest on the Seventh Day. It is a Sabbatism because in it God's people reach a definite stage of attainment, of satisfactorily accomplished purpose, as God Himself did when creation was finished. **ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν,** whoever has entered, not to be restricted to Jesus, as by Alford, **εἰς τ. κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ,** into God's rest, **καὶ αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ.** himself also rested from his (the man's) works as God from His."

The salvation which the writer has previously referred to as a glorious dominion is here spoken of as a Rest. The significance lies in its being God's rest which man is to share. It is the rest which God has enjoyed since the creation. From all His creative work God could

ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ὁ Θεός. 11. Σπουδάσωμεν οὖν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπαυσιν, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ τῆς ἀπειθείας. 12. [d]ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνεργὴς,[1] καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον, καὶ διϊκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε[2] καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ

d Eccl. xii. 11; Esa. xix. 2; Jer. xxiii. 29; 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25; 2 Cor. x. 4, 5; Eph. vi. 17.

[1] T.R. in ℵACDEHKLP; εναργης in B.
[2] ℵABCHLP omit τε.

not be said to rest till, after what cannot but appear to us a million of hazards, man appeared, a creature in whose history God Himself could find a worthy history, whose moral and spiritual needs would elicit the Divine resources and exercise what is deepest in God. When man appears God is satisfied, for here is one in His own image. But from this bare statement of the meaning of God's rest it is obvious that God's people must share it with Him. God's rest is satisfaction in man; but this satisfaction can be perfected only when man is in perfect harmony with Him. His rest is not perfect till they rest in Him. This highly spiritual conception of salvation is involved in our Author's argument. *Cf.* the grand passage on God's Rest in Philo, *De Cherubim*, c. xxvi., and also Barnabas xv., see also Hughes' *The Sabbatical Rest of God and Man.*

Ver. 11. The exhortation follows naturally, "Let us then earnestly strive to enter into that rest, lest anyone fall in the same example of disobedience". The example of disobedience was that given by the wilderness generation and they are warned not to fall in the same way. **πέσῃ ἐν** is commonly construed "fall into," but it seems preferable to render "fall by" or "in"; **πέσῃ** being used absolutely as in Rom. xiv. 4, **στήκει ἢ πίπτει.** Vaughan has "lest anyone fall [by placing his foot] in the mark left by the Exodus generation". **ὑπόδειγμα** is condemned by Phrynichus who says: **οὐδὲ τοῦτο ὀρθῶς λέγεται· παράδειγμα λέγε.** "In Attic **ὑποδείκνυμι** was never used except in its natural sense of *show by implication*; but in Herodotus and Xenophon it signifies *to mark out, set a pattern.*" Rutherford's *Phryn.*, p. 62. *Cf.* viii. 5 of this Epistle with John xiii. 15 for both meanings. It is used in James v. 10 with genitive of the thing to be imitated.

In vv. 12 and 13 another reason is added for dealing sincerely and strenuously with God's promises and especially with this offer of rest. **ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ,** "for the word of God is living," that word of revelation which from the first verse of the Epistle has been in the writer's mind and which he has in chaps. iii., iv. exhibited as a word of promise of entrance into God's rest. Evidently, therefore, **ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ** is not, as Origen and other interpreters have supposed, the Personal Word incarnate in Christ, but God's offers and promises. Not only is the **γάρ,** linking this clause to the promise of rest, decisive for this interpretation; but the mention of **ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς** in ver. 2 and the prominence given in the context to God's promise make it impossible to think of anything else. To enforce the admonition to believe and obey the word of God, five epithets are added, which, says Westcott, "mark with increasing clearness its power to deal with the individual soul. There is a passage step by step from that which is most general to that which is most personal." It is, first, **ζῶν,** "living" or, as A.V. has it, "quick". *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 23, **ἀναγεγεννημένοι . . . διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος,** and ver. 24 **τὸ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.** The meaning is that the word remains efficacious, valid and operative, as it was when it came from the will of God. "It is living as being instinct with the life of its source" (Delitzsch). It is also **ἐνεργὴς,** active, effective, still doing the work it was intended to do, *cf.* Isa. 55-11. **τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον,** "sharper than any two-edged sword". **τομ. ὑπὲρ** is a more forcible comparative than the genitive; *cf.* Luke xvi. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 13. The positive **τομός** is found in Plato *Tim.* 61 E. and elsewhere. **δίστομος** double-mouthed, *i.e.*, double-edged, the sword being considered as a devouring beast, see 2 Sam, xi. 25, **καταφάγεται ἡ μάχαιρα.** A double-edged sword is not only a more formidable weapon than a single-edged, offering less resistance and therefore cutting deeper (see Judges iii. 16 where Ehud made for

μυελῶν, καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας· 13. [e] καὶ οὐκ
ἔστι κτίσις ἀφανὴς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, πάντα δὲ γυμνὰ καὶ τετρα-
χηλισμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος.

e Ps. xxxiii. 13, 14, 15, et xxxiv. 15, et xc. 8, et cxxxix. 11, 12; Ecclus. xv. 19.

himself **μάχαιραν δίστομον** a span long, and *cf.* Eurip., *Helena*, 983), but it was a common simile for sharpness as in Prov. v. 4, **ἠκονημένον μάλλον μαχαίρας δι-στόμου**, whetted more than a two-edged sword; and Rev. i. 16, **ῥομφαία δίστομος ὀξεῖα.** The same comparison is used by Isaiah (xlix. 2) and by St. Paul (Eph. vi. 17); but especially in Wisdom xviii. 15, "Thine Almighty Word leaped down from heaven . . . and brought thine unfeigned commandment as a sharp sword. This sharpness is illustrated by its action, **διϊκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶντε καὶ μυελῶν,** an expression which does not mean that the word divides the soul from the spirit, the joints from the marrow, but that it pierces through all that is in man to that which lies deepest in his nature. "It is obvious that the writer does not mean anything very specific by each term of the enumeration, which produces its effect by the rhetorical fullness of the expressions" (Farrar). For the expression *cf.* Eurip., *Hippol.*, 255 **πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς.** But it is in the succeeding clause that the significance of his description appears; the word is **Κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας** "judging the conceptions and ideas of the heart". The word of God coming to men in the offer of good of the highest kind tests their real desires and inmost intentions. When fellowship with God is made possible through His gracious offer, the inmost heart of man is sifted; and it is infallibly discovered and determined whether he truly loves the good and seeks it, or shrinks from accepting it as his eternal heritage. The terms in which this is conveyed find a striking analogy in Philo (*Quis. Rer. Div. Haer.*, p. 491) where he speaks of God by His Word "cutting asunder the constituent parts of all bodies and objects that seem to be coherent and united. Which [the word] being whetted to the keenest possible edge, never ceases to pierce all sensible objects, and when it has passed through them to the things that are called atoms and indivisible, then again this cutting instrument begins to divide those things which are contemplated by reason into untold and indescribable portions." *Cf.* p. 506. In addition to this (**καὶ**), the inward operation of the word finds its counterpart in the searching, inevitable inquisition of God Himself with whom we have to do. "No created thing is hidden before Him (God) but all things are naked and exposed to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." **τετραχηλισμένα** has created difficulty. **τραχηλίζω** is a word of the games, meaning "to bend back the neck" and so "to overcome". In this sense of overmastering it was in very common use. In Philo, *e.g.*, men are spoken of as **τετραχηλισμένοι ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις.** This meaning, however, gives a poor sense in our passage where it is followed by **τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.** Chrysostom says the word is derived from the skinning of animals, and Theophylact, enlarging upon this interpretation, explains that when the victims had their throats cut, the skin was dragged off from the neck downwards exposing the carcase. No confirmation of this use of the word is given. Perizonius in a note on Ælian, *Var., Hist.*, xii. 58, refers to Suetonius, *Vitell.*, 17, where Vitellius is described as being dragged into the forum, half-naked, with his hands tied behind his back, a rope round his neck and his dress torn; and we are further told that they dragged back his head by his hair, and even pricked him under the chin with the point of a sword as they are wont to do to criminals, that he might let his face be seen and not hang his head. [So, too, Elsner, who refers to Perizonius and agrees that the word means *resupinata*, *manifesta*, eorum quasi cervice ac facie reflexa, atque adeo *intuentium oculis exposita*, genere loquendi ab iis petito, quorum capita reclinantur, ne intuentium oculos fugiant et lateant; quod hominibus qui ad supplicium ducebantur, usu olim accidebat." *Cf.* "Sic fatus galeam laeva tenet, atque reflexa Cervice orantis capulo tenus applicat ensem. Virgil, *Æn.* x. 535.] Certainly this bending back of the head to expose the face gives an excellent and relevant sense here. The reason for thus emphasising the penetrating and inscrutable gaze of God is given in the description appended in the relative

14. [f]Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, f iii. 1, et vi. 20, et
Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας. 15. [g]Οὐ γὰρ vii. 26, et viii. 1, et
ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι [1] ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, ix. 11, 24, et x. 23.
g ii. 17;
Esa. liii. 9; Luc. xxii. 28; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. ii. 7; 1 Peter ii. 22; 1 Joan. iii. 5.

[1] **συμπαθ**, in BcDcEKLP; **συνπαθ**, in ℵAB*CD*H.

clause; it is He **πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος**, which, so far as the mere words go, might mean "of whom we speak" (*cf.* i. 7 and v. 11), but which obviously must here be rendered, as in A.V., "with whom we have to do," or "with whom is our reckoning," *cf.* xiii. 17.

From iv. 14 to x. 15 the writer treats of the Priesthood of the Son. The first paragraph extends from iv. 14-v. 10, and in this it is shown that Jesus has the qualifications of a priest, a call from God, and the sympathy which makes intercession hearty and real. The writer's purpose is to encourage his readers to use the intercession of Christ with confidence, notwithstanding their sense of sinfulness. And he does so by reminding them that all High priests are appointed for the very purpose of offering sacrifice for sin, and that this office has not been assumed by them at their own instance but at the call of God. It is because God desires that sinful men be brought near to Him that priests hold office. And those are called to office, who by virtue of their own experience are prepared to enter into cordial sympathy with the sinner and heartily seek to intercede for him. All this holds true of Christ. He is Priest in obedience to God's call. The office, as He had to fill it, involved much that was repugnant. With strong crying and tears He shrank from the death that was necessary to the fulfilment of His function. But His godly caution prompted as His ultimate prayer, that the will of the Father and not His own might be done. Thus by the things He suffered He learned obedience, and being thus perfected became the author of eternal salvation to all that obey Him, greeted and proclaimed High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

Ver. 14. **Ἔχοντες οὖν . . .** "Having then a great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession." **οὖν** resumes the train of thought started at iii. 1, where the readers were enjoined to consider the High Priest of their confession. But *cf.* Weiss and Kübel. **μέγαν** is now added, as in x. 21, xiii. 20, that they may the rather hold fast the confession they were in danger of letting go. The **μέγαν** is explained and justified by two features of this Priest: (1) He has passed through the heavens and entered thus the very presence of God. For **διεληλ. τ. οὐρανούς** cannot mean, as Calvin renders "qui coelos ingressus est". As the Aaronic High Priest passed through the veil, or, as Grotius and Carpzov suggest, through the various fore courts, into the Holiest place, so this great High Priest had passed through the heavens and appeared among eternal realities. So that the very absence of the High Priest which depressed them, was itself fitted to strengthen faith. He was absent, because dealing with the living God in their behalf. (2) The second mark of His greatness is indicated in His designation **Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τ. Θεοῦ**, the human name suggesting perfect understanding and sympathy, the Divine Sonship acceptance with the Father and pre-eminent dignity. **κρατῶμεν τ. ὁμολογίας.** "Our confession" primarily of this great High Priest, but by implication, our Christian confession, *cf.* iii. 1.

Ver. 15. Confirmation both of the encouragement of ver. 14 and of the fact on which that encouragement is founded is given in the further idea: **οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν . . .** "for we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but has been tempted in all points like us, without sin". He repels an idea which might have found entrance into their minds, that an absent, heavenly priest might not be able to sympathise. **Συνπαθέω** [to be distinguished from **συνπάσχω** which occurs in Rom. viii. 17 and 1 Cor. xii. 26, and means to suffer along with one, to suffer the same ills as another] means to feel for, or sympathise with, and occurs also in x. 34, and is peculiar in N.T. to this writer but found in Aristotle, Isocrates and Plutarch, and in the touching expression of *Acts of Paul and Thekla*, 17, **ὃς μόνος συνεπάθησεν πλανωμένῳ κόσμῳ.** Jesus is able to sympathise with **ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν** "our

h x.19, etc.; Rom. v. 2, 25; Eph. ii. 18, et iii. 12.

πεπειρασμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. 16. [h]προσερχώμεθα οὖν μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, ἵνα λά-

infirmities," the weaknesses which undermine our resistance to temptation and make it difficult to hold fast our confession: moral weaknesses, therefore, though often implicated with physical weaknesses. Jesus can feel for these because **πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα,** He has been tempted in all respects as we are. **κατὰ πάντα,** classical, "in all respects," *cf.* Wetstein on *Acts* xvii. 22; and Evagrius, v. 4, of Christ incarnate, **ὁμοιοπαθῆ κατὰ πάντα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας,** *cf.* ii. 17. **καθ' ὁμοιότητα** may either mean "according to the likeness of our temptations," or, "in accordance with His likeness to us". The latter is preferable, being most in agreement with ii. 17. So Theophylact, **καθ' ὁμοιότητα τὴν ἡμετέραν, τουτέστι παραπλησίως ἡμῖν,** *cf.* Gen. i. 11, 12; and Philo, *De Profug.*, c. 9, **κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τἄλλα ὁμοιότητα.** The writer wishes to preclude the common fancy that there was some peculiarity in Jesus which made His temptation wholly different from ours, that He was a mailed champion exposed to toy arrows. On the contrary, He has felt in His own consciousness the difficulty of being righteous in this world; has felt pressing upon Himself the reasons and inducements that incline men to choose sin that they may escape suffering and death; in every part of His human constitution has known the pain and conflict with which alone temptation can be overcome; has been so tempted that had He sinned, He would have had a thousandfold better excuse than ever man had. Even though His divinity may have ensured His triumph, His temptation was true and could only be overcome by means that are open to all. The one difference between our temptations and those of Jesus is that His were **χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.** Riehm thinks this expression is not exhausted by declaring the fact that in Christ's case temptation never resulted in sin. It means, he thinks, further, and rather, that temptation never in Christ's case sprang from any sinful desire in Himself. So also Delitzsch, Weiss, Westcott, etc. But if Theophylact is right in his indication of the motive of the writer in introducing the words, then it is Christ's successful resistance of temptation which is in the foreground; **ὥστε δύνασθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας διαγενέσθαι.**

Ver. 16. **προσερχώμεθα οὖν. . . .** "Let us, therefore [*i.e.*, seeing that we have this sympathetic and victorious High Priest] with confidence approach the throne of grace". **προσέρχεσθαι** is used in a semi-technical sense for the approach of a worshipper to God, as in LXX frequently. Thus in Lev. xxi. 17 it is said of any blemished son of Aaron **οὐ προσελεύσεται προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ,** and in the 23rd ver. **ἐγγιεῖ** is used as an equivalent, *cf.* Heb. vii. 19. The word is found only once in St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 3, and there in a peculiar sense; but in Heb. it occurs seven times, and generally in its more technical sense, vii. 25, x. 1, 22, xi. 6. It had become so much a technical term of divine worship that it can be used, as in x. 1, 22, without an object. Here, as in vii. 25, it is followed by a dative **τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος,** the seat of supreme authority which by Christ's intercession is now characterised as the source from which grace is dispensed. Premonitions of this are found in O.T.; for although in Ps. xcvi. (xcvii.) 2 and elsewhere we find **δικαιοσύνη καὶ κρίμα κατόρθωσις τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ,** yet in Isa. xvi. 5 we read **διορθωθήσεται μετ' ἐλέους θρόνος.** Philo encourages men to draw near to God by representing "the merciful, and gentle, and compassionate nature of Him who is invoked, who would always rather have mercy than punishment" (*De Execr.*, c. ix). There is also something in Theophylact's remark: **Δύο γὰρ θρόνοι εἰσὶν, ὁ μὲν νῦν χάριτος, . . . ὁ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας παρουσίας θρόνος οὐ χάριτος . . . ἀλλὰ κρίσεως.** Similarly Atto: "Modo tempus est donorum: nemo de se ipso desperet". They are to approach **μετὰ παρρησίας,** for as Philo says (*Quis. Rer. Div. Haer.*, 4): **φιλοδεσπότοις ἀναγκαιότατον ἡ παρρησία κτῆμα**; and in c. 5. **παρρησία φιλίας συγγενές.** The purpose of the approach is expressed in two clauses which Bleek declares to be "ganz synonym". This, however, is scarcely correct. As is apparent from the next verse, the "obtaining mercy" refers to the pardon of sins, while the "finding grace" implies assistance given. So Primasius,

βωμεν ἔλεον,[1] καὶ χάριν εὕρωμεν εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν. V. 1. [a]πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε[2] καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, [a] ii. 17, et viii. 3.

[1] T.R. in CᵇDᶜEL; ελεος ℵABC*D*KP. "The exx. of interchange of -ος masc. Decl. ii., and -ος neut. Decl. iii., have somewhat increased in number [in N.T. Greek] in comparison with those in the classical language" (Blass, *Gram.*, p. 28, E. Tr.).

[2] δωρα τε with ℵACDᶜEKLP; τε omitted by BDᵇ, vg., "ut offerat dona, et sacrificia pro peccatis".

quoted by Westcott "ut misericordiam consequamur, id est remissionem peccatorum, et gratiam donorum Spiritus Sancti". **ἔλεος** and **χάρις** are, however, constantly conjoined (*v.* Hort on 1 Pet. i. 2). The close connection of **χάριν** with **βοήθειαν** suggests that **ἔλεος** is the more general and comprehensive term, and that **χάρις** is becoming already more associated with particular manifestations of **ἔλεος**. There may be **ἔλεος**, where there is no **χάρις**. We first obtain mercy and then find grace. **εὑρίσκειν** is everywhere in LXX used with **χάριν** in this sense, translating מָצָא. **εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν** "for timely help"; assistance in hours of temptation must be timely or it is useless. For **βοήθεια** *cf.* ii. 18; and for the whole verse, see Bishop Wilson's *Maxim*: "The most dangerous of all temptations is to believe, that one can avoid or overcome them by our own strength, and without asking the help of God".

CHAPTER V.—Ver. 1. **Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς . . . γὰρ** introduces the ground of the encouraging counsel of iv. 16, and further confirms iv. 15. [But *cf.* Beza: "Itaque **γὰρ** non tam est causalis quam inchoativa, ut loquuntur grammatici"; and Westcott: "the **γάρ** is explanatory and not directly argumentative".] The connection is: Come boldly to the throne of grace; let not sin daunt you, for *every* high priest is appointed for the very purpose of offering sacrifices *for sin* (*cf.* viii. 3). This he must do because he is appointed by God for this purpose, and he does it readily and heartily because his own subjection to weakness gives him sympathy. **πᾶς ἀρχιερ.** "Every high priest," primarily, every high priest known to you, or every ordinary Levitical high priest. There is no need to extend the reference, as Peirce does, to "others who were not of that order". **ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος,** "being taken from among men," not, "who is taken from etc.," as if defining a certain peculiar and exceptional kind of high priest. It might almost be rendered "since he is taken from among men"; for the writer means that all priesthood proceeds on this foundation, and it is this circumstance that involves what is afterwards more fully insisted upon, that the high priest has sympathy. For **λαμβ.** *cf.* Num. xxv. 4, viii. 6. On the present tense, see below. Grotius renders "segregare, ut quae ex acervo desumimus". Being taken from among men every high priest is also appointed not for his own sake or to fulfil his own purposes, but **ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται,** "is appointed in man's behalf"; not with Calvin, "ordinat ea quae ad Deum pertinent," taking **καθ.** as middle. The word is in common use in classical writers. "The customariness [implied in **λαμβ.** and **καθ.**] applies not to the action of the individual member of the class, but to that of the class as a whole". Burton, *M. and T.*, cxxiv. **τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν,** "in things relating to God"; an adverbial accusative as in Rom. xv. 17. See Blass, *Gram.*, p. 94; and *cf.* Exod. xviii. 19, **γίνου σὺ τῷ λαῷ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.** In all that relates to God the high priest must mediate for men; but he is appointed especially and primarily, **ἵνα προσφέρῃ . . . ἁμαρτιῶν,** "that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins". Were there no sins there would be no priest. The fact that we are sinners, therefore, should not daunt us, or prevent our using the intercession of the priest. **προσφέρειν,** technical term, like our "offer"; not so used in the classics. **δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας,** the same combination is found in viii. 3 and ix. 9 with the same conjunctions. **Δῶρα** as well as **θυσίαι** include all kinds of sacrifices and offerings. Thus in Lev. i. *passim*, *cf.* ver. 3: **ἐὰν ὁλοκαύτωμα τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ.** It is best, therefore, to construe **ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτ.** with **προσφέρειν** and not with **θυσίας**; *cf.* ver. 3 and x. 12. So Bleek and Weiss against Grotius and others; *e.g.*, Westcott, who says: "The clause

b ii. 18, et iv. 15, et vii. 28.
c vii. 27; Lev. ix. 7, et xvi. 3, etc.
d Exod. xxviii.; 1 Par. xxiii. 13; 2 Par. xxvi. 16, etc.

2. [b]μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ἀσθένειαν· 3. [c]καὶ διὰ ταύτην[1] ὀφείλει, καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, οὕτω καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ[2] προσφέρειν ὑπὲρ[3] ἁμαρτιῶν. 4. [d]Καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν, ἀλλὰ ὁ καλούμενος[4]

[1] T.R. read by CcDcEKL; δι αυτην by ℵABC*D*P, 7, 17, 80.
[2] T.R. with ℵACDcEKLP; αυτου with BD*, 219.
[3] υπερ in CcDcEKL; περι in ℵABC*D*P and in Levit. xvi. 6 and 15.
[4] Omit art. with ℵABC*DEK; insert art. CbLP.

ὑπὲρ ἁμ. is to be joined with θυσίας and not with προσφέρῃ as referring to both nouns. The two ideas of eucharistic and expiatory offerings are distinctly marked."

Ver. 2. μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος: "as one who is able to moderate his feeling". The Vulgate is too strong: "qui condolere possit"; Grotius has: "non inclementer affici"; Weizsäcker: "als der billig fühlen kann"; and Peirce: "who can reasonably bear with". As the etymology shows, it means "to be moderate in one's passions". It was opposed by Aristotle to the ἀπάθεια of the Stoics. [Diog. Laert., *Arist.*: ἔφη δὲ τὸν σοφὸν μὴ εἶναι μὲν ἀπαθῆ μετριοπαθῆ δέ: not without feeling, but feeling in moderation; and Peirce, Tholuck, and Weiss conclude that the word was first formed by the Peripatetics; Tholuck expressly; and Weiss, "stammt aus dem philosophischen Sprachgebrauch". *Cf.* the chapter of Philo (*Leg. Allegor.*, iii., 45; Wendland's ed., vol. i. 142) in which he puts ἀπάθεια first and μετριοπάθ. second; and to the numerous exx. cited by Wetstein and Kypke, add Nemesius, *De Natura Hominis*, cxix., where the word is defined in relation to grief. Josephus (*Ant.*, xii. 3, 2) remarks upon the striking self-restraint and moderation (μετριοπαθησάντων) of Vespasian and Titus towards the Jews notwithstanding their many conflicts.] If the priest is cordially to plead with God for the sinner, he must bridle his natural disgust at the loathsomeness of sensuality, his impatience at the frequently recurring fall, his hopeless alienation from the hypocrite and the superficial, his indignation at any confession he hears from the penitent. This self-repression he must exercise τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις: "the ignorant and erring". The single article leads Peirce and others to render as a Hendiadys = τοῖς ἐξ ἀγνοίας πλαν., those who err through ignorance. ἄγνοια is not frequent in LXX, but in Ezek. xlii. 13, and also in chaps. xliv. and xlvi., it translates אָשָׁם, but in Lev. v. 18 and in Eccles. v. 5 it translates שְׁגָגָה which in Lev. iv. 2 and elsewhere is rendered by ἀκουσίως. A comparison too of the passages in which the word occurs seems to show that by "sins of ignorance" are meant both sins committed unawares or accidentally, and sins into which a man is betrayed by passion. They are opposed to presumptuous sins, sins with a high hand ἐν χειρὶ ὑπερηφανίας, בְּיָד רָמָה (Num. xv. 30), sins which constitute a renunciation of God and for which there is no sacrifice, *cf.* x. 26. ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ἀσθένειαν: "since he himself also is compassed with infirmity," giving the reason or ground of μετριοπ. δυνάμενος. περίκειμαι, "I lie round," as in Mk. ix. 42, Luke xvii. 2 with περί and in Heb. xii. 1 with dative. In Acts xxviii. 20, τὴν ἅλυσιν ταύτην περίκειμαι, it is used passively as here, followed by an accusative according to the rule that verbs which in the active govern a dative of the person with an accusative of the thing, retain the latter in the passive. See Winer, p. 287, and Rutherford's *Babrius*. The priests, living for the greater part of the year in their own homes, were known to have their weaknesses like other men, and even the high priests were not exempt from the common passions. Their gorgeous robes alone separated them from sinners, but like a garment infirmity clung around them. "How the very sanctity of his office would force on the attention of one who was not a mere puppet priest the contrast between his official and his personal character, as a subject of solemn reflection" (Bruce).

Ver. 3. καὶ δι' αὐτὴν . . . ἁμαρτιῶν "and because of it is bound as for the people, so also for himself to offer for sins". Vaughan recommends the dele-

ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθάπερ[1] καὶ ὁ[2] Ἀαρών. 5. [e]οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασε γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα, ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτόν, "Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε". 6. [f]καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει, "Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ".

[e] i. 5; Ps. ii. 7; Joan. viii. 54; Acts xiii. 33.
[f] vii. 17; Ps. cx. 4.

[1] καθαπερ in ℵ[c]CbD[c]EKLP; καθωσπερ in ℵ*ABD*, 17.
[2] Delete ο with ℵABCD, etc., and in conformity with this writer's usage.

tion of the stop at the end of ver. 2. The law which enjoined that the high priest should on the Day of Atonement sacrifice for himself and his house (**ἐξιλάσεται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ**) before he sacrificed **περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ**, is given in Lev. xvi. 6, 15.

Ver 4. **καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν** "And no one taketh to himself this honourable office." **καί** introduces a second qualification of the priest, implied in **καθίσταται** of ver. 1, but now emphasised. An additional reason for trusting in the priest is that he has not assumed the office to gratify his own ambition but to serve God's purpose of restoring men to His fellowship. All genuine priesthood is the carrying out of God's will. The priest must above all else be *obedient*, in sympathy with God as well as in sympathy with man. God's appointment also secures that the suitable qualifications will be found in the priest. The office is here called **τιμή**, best translated by the German "Ehrenamt" or "Ehrenstelle." For **τιμή** meaning an office see Eurip., *Helena*, 15; Herodot., ii. 65, **παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδέκεται τὴν τιμήν**; and especially Aristotle, *Pol.*, iii. 10, **τιμὰς γὰρ λέγομεν εἶναι τὰς ἀρχάς.** *Cf.* Hor. i. 1, 8 "tergeminis honoribus". Frequently in Josephus **τιμή** is used of the high priesthood, see *Antiq.*, xii. 2-5, iv. 1, etc.; and the same writer should be consulted for the historical illustration of this verse (*Antiq.*, iii. 8-1). In this remarkable passage he represents Moses as saying **ἔγωγε . . . ἐμαυτὸν ἂν τῆς τιμῆς ἄξιον ἔκρινα . . . νῦν δ' αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς Ἀαρῶνα τῆς τιμῆς ταύτης ἄξιον ἔκρινε.** The *nolo episcopari* implied in the words is amply illustrated in the case of Augustine, of John Knox, and especially of Anselm who declared he would rather have been cast on a stack of blazing faggots than set on the archiepiscopal throne, and continued to head his letters "Brother Anselm monk of Bec by choice, Archbishop of Canterbury by violence". On the other hand, see the account of the appointment by his own act (**αὐτόχειρ**) of the priest king in Aricia, in Strabo v. 3-12 and elsewhere. **ἀλλὰ καλούμενος . . . καθώσπερ καὶ Ἀαρών.** "but when called by God as in point of fact even Aaron was". If the article is retained before **καλ.** we must translate "but he that is called," **καλούμενος** "in diesem amtlichen Sinne nur hier," says Weiss, but see Matt. iv. 21, Gal. i. 15. For Aaron's call, see Exod. xxviii. 1 ff. Schöttgen and Wetstein appositely quote from the *Bammidbar Rabbi* "Moses said to Korah and his associates:—If my brother Aaron took to himself the priesthood, then ye did well to rebel against him; but in truth God gave it to him, whose is the greatness and the power and the glory. Whosoever, then, rises against Aaron, does he not rise against God?" It is notorious that the contemporary priesthood did not fulfil the description here given.

Ver. 5. **οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς. . . .** "So even the Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest." ["So hat auch der Christus nicht sich selbst die Herrlichkeit des Hohenpriestertums zugeeignet," Weizsäcker.] The designation, "the Christ," is introduced, because it might not have seemed so significant a statement if made of "Jesus". It was not personal ambition that moved Christ. He did not come in His own name, nor did He seek to glorify Himself. See John viii. 54; v. 31, 43; xvii. 5, and *passim.* **ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας . . . Μελχισεδέκ.** "but He [glorified Him to be made a priest] who said, Thou art My Son, I this day have begotten Thee; as also in another place He says, Thou art a priest for ever after the order Melchizedek". The question here is: Why does the writer introduce the quotation from the 2nd Psalm at all? Why does he not directly prove his point by the quotation from the Messianic 110th Psalm? Does he mean that He who said, Thou art my Son, glorified Christ as priest *in saying this?* Apparently he does, otherwise the **καὶ** in **καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ** would be unwarranted. By introducing the former of the two quotations and designating

g Matt. xxvi. 38, etc., et xxvii. 46, 50; Marc. xiv. 33, 36, et xv. 34, 37; Luc. xxii. 42, et xxiii. 46; Joan. xii. 27, et xvii. 1.

7. g Ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου, μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς

God as He that called Christ Son, or nominated him to the Messianic dignity, which involved the priesthood, he shows that the greater and more comprehensive office of Messiahship was not assumed by Christ at His own instance and therefore that the priesthood included in this was not of His own seeking, but of God's ordaining; *cf.* Weiss. Bleek says the reference to Psalm ii. is made to lessen the marvel that God should glorify Christ as priest. Similarly Riehm "dass Christus in einem so unvergleichlich innigen Verhältnisse zu Gott steht, dass seine Berufung zum Hohepriesteramt nicht befreundlich sein kann;" and Davidson, "It is by no means meant that the priesthood of Christ was *involved* in His Sonship (Alford), an *a priori* method of conception wholly foreign to the Epistle, but merely that it was suitable in one who was Son, being indeed possible to none other (see on i. 3)." Bruce thinks the writer wishes to teach that Christ's priesthood is coeval with His Sonship and inherent in it. **κατὰ τὴν τάξιν** "after the order;" among its other meanings **τάξις** denotes a class or rank, "ordo quâ dicitur quispiam senatorii ordinis, vel equestris ordinis". Thus in Demosthenes, **οἰκέτου τάξιν οὐκ ἐλευθέρου παιδὸς ἔχων**, in Diod. Sic., iii. 6, **οἱ περὶ τὰς τῶν θεῶν θεραπείας διατρίβοντες ἱερεῖς, μεγίστην καὶ κυριωτάτην τάξιν ἔχοντες.** In the subsequent exposition of the Melch. priesthood it is chiefly on **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα** that emphasis is laid.

Ver 7. **ὃς . . . ἔμαθεν . . . καὶ ἐγένετο.** In these verses the writer shows how much there was in the call to the priesthood repugnant to flesh and blood; how it was through painful obedience, not by arrogant ambition he became Priest. The main statement is, He learned obedience and became perfect as Saviour. **ὃς ἐν τ. ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ** "who in the days of His flesh," and when therefore He was like His brethren in capacity for temptation and suffering; *cf.* ii. 14. **δεήσεις . . . προσενέγκας** "having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death". **προσενέγκας** has sometimes been supposed to refer to the **προσφέρειν** of ver. 3, and to have a sacrificial sense. It was such an offering as became His innocent **ἀσθένεια.** As the ordinary high priest prepared himself for offering for the people by offering for himself, so, it is thought, Christ was prepared for the strictly sacrificial or priestly work by the feeling of His own weakness. There is truth in this. Weiss' reason for excluding this reference is "dass ein Opfern mit starkem Geschrei und Thränen eine unvollziehbare Vorstellung ist". *Cf.* Davidson, p. 113, note. **προσφ.** is used with **δέησιν** in later Greek writers: instances in Bleek. **δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας,** these words are elsewhere combined as in Isocrates, *De Pace*, 46; Polybius, iii. 112, 8; *cf.* Job. xl. 22. The relation of the two words is well brought out in a passage from Philo quoted by Carpzov: **γραφὴ δὲ μηνύσει μου τὴν δέησιν ἣν ἀνθ' ἱκετηρίας προτείνω.** *Cf.* Eurip., *Iph. Aul.*, 1216. **ἱκετηρία** [from **ἵκω** I come, **ἱκέτης** one who comes as a suppliant] is originally an adjective = fit for suppliants, then an olive branch [sc. **ἐλαία,** or **ῥάβδος**] bound with wool which the suppliant carried as a symbol of his prayer. The conjunction of words in this verse is for emphasis. These supplications were accompanied **μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων** "with strong crying and tears," expressing the intensity of the prayers and so the keenness of the suffering. The "strong crying" is striking. Schöttgen quotes: "There are three kinds of prayers, each loftier than the preceding: prayer, crying, and tears. Prayer is silent, crying with raised voice, tears overcome all things." It is to the scene in Gethsemane reference is made, and although "tears" are not mentioned by the evangelists in relating that scene, they are implied, and this writer might naturally thus represent the emotion of our Lord. The prayer was addressed **πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου** "to Him that was able to save Him from death," which implies that the prayer was that Christ might be saved from death ["Father if it be possible, let this cup pass from me"] but also suggests that the prayer was not formally answered —else why emphasise that God had power to answer it? **σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου.** The

καὶ δακρύων προσενέγκας, καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, 8. [h] καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοὴν, 9. [i] καὶ τελειω- [h] Phil. ii. 6, etc. [i] ii. 10.

prayer recorded in Mark xiv. 36, and the anticipation of Gethsemane alluded to in John xii. 57 [**Πάτερ σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης**] are sufficient to show that it is deliverance from dying that is meant. Milligan, however, says: "Christ is thus represented as praying not that death may be averted, but that He may be saved 'out of it,' when it comes." Westcott thinks the word covers both ideas and that in the first sense the prayer was not granted, that it might be granted in the second. It is preferable to abide by the simple statement that the passion of Christ's prayer to escape death was intensified by the fact that He knew God could deliver Him by twelve legions of angels or otherwise. His absolute faith in the Father's almighty power and infinite resource was the very soul of his trial. **καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας** "and having been heard on account of His godly reverence". **εὐλάβεια** [from **εὖ λαβεῖν** to take good hold, or careful hold] denotes the cautious regard which a wise man pays to all the circumstances of an action. Thus Fabius Cunctator was termed **εὐλαβὴς**. And in regard to God **εὐλάβεια** means that reverent submission to His will which caution or prudence dictates. [See Prov. xxviii. 14 and the definitions by Philo. *Quis. Rer. Div. Haer.*, 6.] That **ἀπό** following **εἰσακουσθεὶς** means in Biblical Greek "on account of" we have proof in Job xxxv. 12 and Luke xix. 3, as well as from the frequent use of **ἀπό** in N.T. to denote cause, John xxi. 6; Acts xii. 14, etc. In classical Greek also **ἀπό** is used for *propter*, see Aristoph., *Knights*, l. 767 **ὡς ἀπὸ μικρῶν εὔνους αὐτῷ θωπευματίων γεγένησαι.** See also the *Birds*, l. 150. The cautious reverence, or reverent caution—the fear lest He should oppose God or seem to overpersuade Him—which was heard and answered was expressed in the second petition of the prayer in Gethsemane, "Not my will but thine be done". And **ἀπό** is used in preference to **διά**, apparently because the source of the particular petition is meant to be indicated, that we may understand that the truest answer to this reverent submission was to give Him the cup to drink and thus to accomplish through Him the faultless will of God. To have removed the cup and saved Him from death would not have answered the **εὐλάβεια** of the prayer. The meaning of the clause is further determined by what follows.

Ver. 8. **καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν** [having been heard . . .] although He was a son He learned obedience from the things He suffered. The result of his being heard was therefore that he suffered, but in the suffering He learned obedience, perfect unison with the will of God for the salvation of men so that He became a perfected Priest. He learned obedience **καίπερ ὢν υἱός**: "this is stated to obviate the very idea of assumption on his part" (Davidson). Perhaps, therefore, we should translate, with a reference to ver. 5, "although He was Son". Although Son and therefore possessed of Divine love and in sympathy with the Divine purpose, He had yet to learn that perfect submission which is only acquired by obeying in painful, terrifying circumstances. He made deeper and deeper experience of what obedience is and costs. And *the particular obedience* [**τὴν ὑπακ.**] which was required of Him in the days of His flesh was that which at once gave Him perfect entrance into the Divine love and human need. It is when the child is told to do something which pains him, and which he shrinks from, that he learns obedience, learns to submit to another will. And the things which Christ suffered in obeying God's will taught Him perfect submission and at the same time perfect devotedness to man. On this obedience, see Robertson Smith in *Expositor* for 1881, p. 424. **καίπερ** is often joined with the participle to emphasise its concessive use [see Burton, 437], as in Diod. Sic., iii. 17, **οὗτος ὁ βίος καίπερ ὢν παράδοξος. ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε,** a common form of attraction and also a common proverbial saying, of which Wetstein gives a number of instances; Herodot. i. 207; Æsch., *Agam.*, 177, **πάθει μάθος,** Demosth., 1232 **τοὺς μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν μανθάνοντας.** Carpzov also quotes several from Philo, as from the *De Somn.*, **ὁ παθὼν ἀκριβῶς ἔμαθεν,** and *De Profug.*, 25. **ἔμαθον μὲν ὃ ἔπαθον.** see also Blass, *Gram.*, p. 299 E. Tr.

Ver. 9. **καὶ τελειωθεὶς . . . αἰωνίου** "and having [thus] been perfected became to all who obey Him the source [originator] of eternal salvation". **τελειωθεὶς** (v. ii. 10) having been perfectly equipped with every qualification for the

θεὶς ἐγένετο τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ πᾶσιν αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου· 10. προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.

11. Περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν, ἐπεὶ

priestly office by the discipline already described. Several interpreters (Theodoret, Bleek, Westcott) include in the word the exaltation of Christ, but illegitimately. The word must be interpreted by its connection with **ἔμαθεν ὑπακοήν**; and here it means the completion of Christ's moral discipline, which ended in His death. He thus became **αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου** author, or cause of eternal salvation, in fulfilment of the call to an eternal priesthood, ver. 6 **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα** and ver. 10. **αἴτιος** frequently used in a similar sense from Homer downwards, as in Diod. Sic., iv. 82, **αἴτιος ἐγένετο τῆς σωτηρίας.** Aristoph., *Clouds*, 85, **οὗτος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς αἴτιός μοι τῶν κακῶν.** Philo, *De Agri.*, 22, **πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ** with a reference to **τὴν ὑπακ.** of ver. 8. The saved must pass through an experience similar to the Saviour's. Their salvation is in learning to obey. Thus they are harmonised to the one supreme and perfect will. This is reversely given in ii. 10.

Ver. 10. **προσαγορευθεὶς . . . Μελχισεδέκ** "styled by God High Priest after the order of Melchizedek". "**προσαγορεύειν** expresses the formal and solemn ascription of the title to Him to whom it belongs ('addressed as,' 'styled')" (Westcott). "When the Son ascended and appeared in the sanctuary on High, God saluted Him or addressed Him as an High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, and, of course, in virtue of such an address constituted Him such an High Priest" (Davidson). Originally called to the priesthood by the words of Ps. cx., He is now by His resurrection and ascension declared to be perfectly consecrated and so installed as High Priest after the order of Melchizedek. It may be doubted, however, whether the full meaning of **προσαγορεύειν** "address" should here be found. The commoner meaning in writers of the time is "named" or "called". Thus in Plutarch's *Pericles*, iv. 4, Anaxagoras, **ὃν Νοῦν προσηγόρευον**, xxvii. 2, **λευκὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην προσαγ.**, xxiv. 6, of Aspasia, **Ἥρα προσαγορεύεται.** and viii. 2 of Pericles himself, **Ὀλύμπιον . . . προσαγορευθῆναι.** So in Diod. Sic., i. 51, of the Egyptians, **τάφους ἀϊδίους οἴκους προσαγορεύουσιν.** It cannot be certainly concluded either from the tense or the context that this "naming" is to be assigned to the date of the ascension and not to the original appointment. The emphasis is on the words **ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ,** not by man but by God has Christ been named High Priest; and on **κατὰ . . . Μελχ.** as warranting **αἰωνίου.**

The passage v. 11 to vi. 20 is a digression occasioned by the writer's reflection that his argument from the priesthood of Melchizedek may be too difficult for his hearers. In order to stimulate attention he chides and warns them, pointing out the danger of backwardness. He justifies, however, his delivery of difficult doctrine notwithstanding their sluggishness, and this on two grounds: (1) because to lay again the foundations after men have once known them is useless (vi. 1-8); and (2) because he cannot but believe that his readers are after all in scarcely so desperate a condition. They need to have their hope renewed. This hope they have every reason to cherish, seeing that their fathers have already entered into the enjoyment of it, that God who cannot lie has sworn to the fulfilment of the promises, and that Jesus has entered the heavenly world as their forerunner. Ver. 11-14. Complaint of their sluggishness of mind.

Ver. 11. **περὶ οὗ.** "Of whom," not, as Grotius (*cf.* Delitzsch and von Soden) "De quâ," of which priesthood. It is simplest to refer the relative to the last word **Μελχισεδέκ**; possible to refer it to **ἀρχιερεὺς . . . Μελχ.** The former seems justified by the manner in which c. vii. resumes **οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχ.** No doubt the reference is not barely to Melchizedek, but to Melchizedek as type of Christ's priesthood. Concerning Melchisedek he has much to say **πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος,** not exactly equivalent to **ἡμῶν ὁ λόγος,** but rather signifying "the exposition which it is incumbent on us to undertake". [*Cf. Antigone*, 748, **ὁ γοῦν λόγος σοι πᾶς ὑπὲρ κείνης ὅδε.**] The exposition is necessarily of some extent (c. vii.), although of his whole letter he finds it possible to say (xiii. 22) **διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα.** It is also **δυσερμήνευτος** "difficult to explain," "hard to render intelligible," "ininterpretabilis"

νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς. 12. [k] καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσ- [k] 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2, 3; 1 Peter ii. 2.
καλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον, πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς, τίνα [1]
τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν

[1] **τίνα** as in Syr., vg., "quae sint elementa". So Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Cyril. **τινὰ** Lachmann, WH, Baljon; after Œcumenius and as giving better sense.
"Theory is the guide of practice, practice the life of theory" (Roberts, *Clavis Bibliorum*). "The interpreter needs oratio, meditatio, tentatio."

(Vulg.); used of dreams in Artemidorus, **τοῖς πολλοῖς δυσερμήνευτοι** (Wetstein). This difficulty, however, arises not wholly from the nature of the subject, but rather from the unpreparedness of the readers, **ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς** "seeing that you are become dull of hearing". **νωθρός** = **νωθής** [see *Prom. Vinct.*, 62] slow, sluggish; used by Dionysius Hal., to denote **λίθου φύσιν ἀναίσθητον, ἀκίνητον.** But Plato was said to be **νωθρός** in comparison with Aristotle. Babrius uses the word of the numbed limbs of the sick lion and of the "stupid" hopes of the wolf that heard the nurse threaten to throw the child to the wolves. **ταῖς ἀκοαῖς** "in your sense of hearing." Both in classical and biblical Greek **ἀκοή** has three meanings, "the thing heard," as in John xii. 38; "the sense of hearing," as in 1 Cor. xii. 17; and "the ear," as in Mark vii. 35, **ἠνοίγησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀκοαί**; *cf.* Plummer on Luke, p. 194. Here the ear stands for intelligent and spiritual reception of truth. **γεγόνατε**, "ye are become," and therefore were not always. It is not a natural and inherent and pardonable weakness of understanding he complains of, but a culpable incapacity resulting from past neglect of opportunities.

Ver. 12. **καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες. . . .** "For indeed, though in consideration of the time [since you received Christ] ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you the rudiments of the beginning [the elements] of the oracles of God."—**διὰ τὸν χρόνον**, *cf.* ii. 3, x. 32; how long they had professed Christianity we do not know, but quite possibly for twenty or thirty years. Those who had for a time themselves been Christians were expected to have made such attainment in knowledge as to become **διδάσκαλοι.** This advance was their duty, **ὀφείλοντες.** Instead of thus accumulating Christian knowledge, they had let slip even the rudiments, so far at any rate as to allow them to fall into the background of their mind and to become inoperative. Their primal need of instruction had recurred. The need had again arisen, **τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινὰ** "of some one teaching you," the genitive following **χρείαν**, as in ver. 12 and in x. 36. The indefinite pronoun seems preferable, as the form of the sentence requires an expressed subject to bring out the contrast to **εἶναι διδάσκαλοι**, and to **ὑμᾶς. τὰ στοιχεῖα . . . Θεοῦ.** The meaning of **τῆς ἀρχῆς** would seem to be determined by **τῆς ἀρχῆς τ. Χριστοῦ** in vi. 1, where it apparently denotes the initial stages of a Christian profession, the stages in which the elements of the Christian faith would naturally be taught. Here, then, "the beginning of the oracles of God" would mean the oracles of God as taught in the beginning of one's education by these oracles. This of itself is a strong enough expression, but to make it stronger **τὰ στοιχεῖα** is added, as if he said "the rudiments of the rudiments," the A B C of the elements. **τῶν λογίων τ. θεοῦ,** "oraculorum Dei, *i.e.*, Evangelii, in quo maxima et summe necessaria sunt Dei oracula, quae et sic dicuntur, 1 Peter iv. 11" (Grotius). The "Oracles of God" sometimes denote the O.T., as in Rom. iii. 2, Acts vii. 38; but here it is rather the utterance of God through the Son (i. 1), the salvation preached by the Lord (ii. 3) (so Weiss). **καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος . . .** "and are become such as have need of milk and not of solid food," "et facti estis quibus lacte opus sit, non solido cibo" (Vulgate). For the metaphor, *cf.* 1 Peter ii. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 1-3, a strikingly analogous passage, *cf.* John xvi. 12, and the Rabbinic term for young students "Theenekoth" "Sucklings" (Schoettgen). The same figure is found in Philo, *De Agric.*, ii. (Wendland, vol. ii., p. 96) **ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίοις μέν ἐστι γάλα τροφή, τελείοις δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα· καὶ ψυχῆς κ.τ.λ.** Abundant illustrations from Greek literature in Wetstein. Instead of becoming adults, able to stand on their own feet, select and digest their own food, they had fallen into spiritual dotage, had entered a second childhood, and could

1 Cor. iii. 2, et xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 14.

ἔχοντες γάλακτος, καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς. 13. [1]πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος, ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης· νήπιος γάρ ἐστι· 14. τελείων δέ ἐστιν ἡ στερεὰ τροφὴ, τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνα-

only receive the simplest nourishment. Milk represents traditional teaching, that which has been received and digested by others, and is suitable for those who have no teeth of their own and no sufficiently strong powers of digestion. This teaching is admirably adapted to the first stage of Christian life, but it cannot form mature Christians. For this, **στερεὰ τροφή** is essential.

Ver. 13. **πᾶς γὰρ . . . νήπιος γάρ ἐστι.** "For every one who partakes of milk [as his sole diet] is without experience of the word of righteousness; for he is a babe." The reference of **γὰρ** is somewhat obscure. It seems intended to substantiate the last clause of ver. 12: "Ye cannot receive solid food, *for* you have no experience of the word of righteousness". But he softens the statement by generalising it. Every one that lives on milk is necessarily unacquainted with the higher teaching, which is now **λόγος δικ.** **ἄπειρος** having no experience of, ignorant; as **κακότητος ἄπειροι,** Empedocles in Fairbanks, *Phil. of Greece*, p. 202. **ἄπειρος ἀγρεύειν,** Babrius, lxix. 2; **ἄπ. τοῦ ἀγωνίζεσθαι,** Antiphon, Jebb, p. 8. **λόγου δικαιοσύνης,** with teaching of righteous conduct the suckling has nothing to do; he cannot act for himself, but can merely live and grow; he cannot discern good and evil, and must take what is given him. Righteousness is not within the suckling's horizon. He cannot as yet be taught it; still less can he be a teacher of it (ver. 12) **νήπιος γάρ ἐστι,** for he cannot even speak [**νη-ἔπος**=infans], he is an infant. The infant can neither understand nor impart teaching regarding a life of which he has no experience, and whose language he does not know. Indirectly, this involves that the higher instruction the writer wished to deliver was important because of its bearing on conduct. [Other interpretations abound. Chrysostom and Theophylact understand the reference to be either to the Christian life or to Christ Himself and the knowledge of His person. Others, as Beza, Lünemann, and many others, take it as "a periphrasis for Christianity or the Gospel, inasmuch as the righteousness which avails with God is precisely the contents of the Gospel". Riehm also thinks that the Gospel is meant, "because it leads to righteousness". Westcott understands it of the "teaching which deals at once with the one source of righteousness in Christ, and the means by which man is enabled to be made partaker of it". The view of Carpzov, and also that of Bleek, is governed by the connection of Melchizedek with righteousness in vii. 2.]

Ver. 14. **τελείων δὲ. . . .** "But solid food is for the mature, those who, by reason of their mental habits, have their senses exercised to discern good and evil." **τέλειος** commonly opposed in classical and Biblical Greek to **νήπιος;** as in Polyb. v. 29, 2, **ἐλπίσαντες ὡς παιδίῳ νηπίῳ χρήσασθαι τῷ Φιλίππῳ, εὗρον αὐτὸν τέλειον ἄνδρα.** *Cf.* Eph. iv. 13; and Xen., *Cyr.*, viii. 7, 3. They are here further defined as **τῶν . . . κακοῦ.** **ἕξις** [from **ἔχω,** as habitus from habeo], a habit of body, or of mind; as in Plato, *Laws* (p. 666), **τὴν ἐμμανῆ ἕξιν τῶν νέων.** Also, p. 966, **Ἀνδραπόδου γάρ τινα σὺ λέγεις ἕξιν.** Aristotle (*Nic. Eth.* ii. 5) determines that virtue is neither a **δύναμις** nor a **πάθος,** but a **ἕξις,** a faculty being something natural and innate, while virtue is not. Plutarch (*Moral.*, 443), following him, defines **ἕξις** as **ἰσχὺς . . . ἐξ ἔθους ἐγγινομένη,** which resembles Quintilian's definition (x. 1, 1), "firma quaedam facilitas, quae apud Graecos **ἕξις** nominatur". Aristotle (*Categor.*, viii. 1) distinguishes **ἕξις** from **διάθεσις, τῷ πολὺ χρονιώτερον εἶναι καὶ μονιμώτερον,** but elsewhere he uses the words as equivalents. Longinus (xliv. 4) uses it of faculty. **ἕξις,** then, is the habitual or normal condition, the disposition or character; and the expression in the text means that the mature, by reason of their maturity or mental habit, have their senses exercised, etc. **αἰσθητήρια:** "senses". Bleek quotes the definition of the Greek lexicographers and of Damascene **τὰ ὄργανα ἢ τὰ μέλη δι' ὧν αἰσθανόμεθα.** So Galen in Wetstein, "organs of sense". Here the reference is to spiritual faculties of perception and taste. **γεγυμνασμένα . . . πρὸς διάκρισιν . . .,** "exercised so as to discriminate between good and evil," *i.e.*, between what is wholesome and what is hurtful in teaching. [Wetstein quotes from Galen, *De Dignot. Puls.*, **ὃς μὲν γὰρ τὸ αἰσθητήριον ἔχει**

σμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ. VI. 1. Διὸ ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον, ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώ-

γεγυμνασμένον ἱκανῶς οὗτος ἄριστος ἂν εἴη γνώμων.] The child must eat what is given to it; the boy is warned what to eat and what to avoid; as he grows, his senses are exercised by a various experience, so that when he reaches manhood he does not need a nurse or a priest to teach him what is nutritious and what is poisonous. The first evidence of maturity which the writer cites is ability to teach; the second, trained discernment of what is wholesome in doctrine. The one implies the other. *Cf.* Isa. vii. 16, **πρὶν γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν**, and Deut. i. 39. Chrysostom says **οὐ περὶ βίου ὁ λόγος . . . ἀλλὰ περὶ δογμάτων ὑγιῶν καὶ ὑψηλῶν διεφθαρμένων τε καὶ ταπεινῶν**; the whole passage should be consulted.

CHAPTER VI.—Ver. 1. **Διὸ** "wherefore," *i.e.*, because beginnings belong to a stage which ought long since to have been left behind (v. 12), **ἀφέντες . . .** let us abandon [give up] the elementary teaching about Christ and press on to maturity. [Of the use of **ἀφιέναι** in similar connections Bleek gives many instances of which Eurip., *Androm.*, 393 may be cited: **ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφεὶς πρὸς τὴν τελευτὴν ὑστέραν οὖσαν φέρῃ. ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα** is an expression which was in vogue in the Pythagorean schools. [Westcott and Weiss press the passive. "The thought is not primarily of personal effort . . . but of personal surrender to an active influence." But **φέρομαι** is used where it is difficult to discover a passive sense.] It is questioned whether the words are merely the expression of the teacher's resolution to advance to a higher stage of instruction, or are meant as an exhortation to the readers to advance to perfectness. Davidson advocates the former view, Peake the latter. It would seem that the author primarily refers to his own teaching. The context and the use of **λόγον** favour this view. He has been chiding them for remaining so long "babes," able to receive only "milk"; let us, he says, leave this rudimentary teaching and proceed to what is more nutritious. But with his advance in teaching, their advance in knowledge and growth in character is closely bound up. What the writer definitely means by **τὸν τ. ἀρχῆς τ. Χριστοῦ λόγον**, he explains in his detailed description of the "foundation," which is not again to be laid. It consists of the teaching that must first be given to those who seek some knowledge of Christ. Westcott explains the expression thus: "*the word*, the exposition, *of the beginning*, the elementary view *of the Christ*"; although he probably too narrowly restricts the meaning of "the beginning of Christ" when he explains it as "the fundamental explanation of the fulfilment of the Messianic promises in Jesus of Nazareth". Weiss thinks the writer urges abandonment of the topics with which he and his readers had been occupied in the Epistle ["also des bisherigen Inhalts des Briefes".] But this is not necessarily implied, and indeed is excluded by the advanced character of much of the preceding teaching. What was taught the Hebrews at their first acquaintance with the Christ must be abandoned, not as if it had been misleading, but as one leaves behind school books or foundations: "non quod eorum oblivisci unquam debeant fideles, sed quia in illis minime est haerendum". Calvin: as Paul says, **τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος**, Phil. iii. 13. **μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι** "not again and again laying a foundation". **θεμέλιον** possibly a neuter (see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 119) as in Acts xvi. 16; certainly masculine in 2 Tim. ii. 19; Heb. xi. 10; Rev. xxi. 14, 19 twice. **καταβαλλ.** the usual word for expressing the idea of "laying" foundations, as in Dionys. Hal., iii. 69; Josephus *Ant.*, xv. 11, 3; metaphorically in Eurip., *Helena*, 164; hence **καταβολὴ κόσμου**, the foundation of the world. Then follow six particulars in which this foundation consists. Various arrangements and interpretations have been offered. Dr. Bruce says: "We are tempted to adopt another hypothesis, namely, that the last four are to be regarded as the foundation of the first two, conceived not as belonging to the foundation, but rather as the superstructure. On this view we should have to render 'Not laying again a foundation for repentance and faith, consisting in instructions concerning baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection, and judgment.' In favour of this construction is the reading **διδαχήν** found in B, and adopted by Westcott and Hort, which being in opposition with **θεμέλιον** suggests that the four things following form the foundation

μεθα· μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ Θεὸν, 2. βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς,[1] ἐπιθέσεώς τε

[1] T.R. in ℵACDEKL, vg.; διδαχην in B.

of repentance and faith." But Dr. Bruce returns to the idea that six articles are mentioned as forming the foundation, and Westcott, although adopting the reading **διδαχήν**, makes no use of it. Balfour (*Central Truths*) in an elaborate paper on the passage suggests that only four articles are mentioned, the words, **βαπτισμῶν . . . χειρῶν** being introduced parenthetically, because the writer cannot refrain from pointing out that repentance and faith were respectively taught by two legal rites, baptism and laying on of hands. The probability, however, is, as we shall see, that six fundamentals are intended, and that they are not so non-Christian as is sometimes supposed. These six fundamentals are arranged in three pairs, the first of which is **μετανοίας . . . Θεόν** "repentance from dead works and faith toward God". Repentance and faith are conjoined in Mark i. 15; Acts xx. 21; *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 9. They are found together in Scripture because they are conjoined in life, and are indeed but different aspects of one spiritual act. A man repents because a new belief has found entrance into his mind. Repentance is here characterised as **ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων.** Many explanations are given. ["Hanc vero phrasin apud scriptores Judaicos mihi nondum occurrisse lubens fateor" (Schoettgen).] The only other place where works are thus designated is ix. 14, where the blood of Christ is said to cleanse the conscience from dead works and thus to fit for the worship of the living God; on which Chrysostom remarks **εἴ τις ἥψατο τότε νεκροῦ ἐμιαίνετο· καὶ ἐνταῦθα εἴ τις ἅψαιτο νεκροῦ ἔργου, μολύνεται διὰ τῆς συνειδήσεως,** as if sins were called "dead" simply because they defile and unfit for God's worship. [On this view Weiss remarks, "wenigstens etwas Richtiges zu Grunde".] Others think that "dead" here means "deadly" or "death-bringing"; so Peirce; or that it is meant that sins have no strength, are "devoid of life and power"; so Tholuck, Alford; or are "vain and fruitless" (Lünemann). Hofmann says that every work is dead in which there is not inherent any life from God. Similarly Westcott, who says: "There is but one spring of life and all which does not flow from it is 'dead'. All acts of a man in himself, separated from God, are 'dead works'." Davidson thinks that this is "hardly enough," and adds "they seem so called because being sinful they belong to the sphere of that which is separate from the living God, the sphere of death (ii. 14, etc.)". Rather it may be said that dead works are such as have no living connection with the character but are done in mere compliance with the law and therefore accomplish nothing. They are like a dead fleece laid on a wolf, not a part of his life and growing out of him. *Cf.* Bleek and Weiss. Such repentance was especially necessary in Jewish Christians. **καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν,** the counterpart of the preceding. The abandonment of formal, external righteousness results from confidence in God as faithful to His promises and furnishing an open way to Himself. What is meant is not only faith in God's existence, which of course had not to be taught to a Jew, but trust in God. Faith is either **εἰς, πρός, ἐν,** or **ἐπί** as union, relation, rest, or direction is meant (Vaughan).

Ver. 2. The next pair, **βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν** "instruction regarding washings and laying on of hands". "The historical sequence is followed in the enumeration". Some interpreters make all three conditions directly dependent on **θεμέλιον,** "foundation of baptisms, teaching, and laying on of hands". Bengel makes **διδαχῆς** dependent on **βαπτ.** He says: "**βαπτισμοὶ διδαχῆς** erant *baptismi*, quos qui suscipiebant, *doctrinae* sacrae Judaeorum sese addicebant. Itaque adjecto **διδαχῆς** *doctrinae* distinguuntur a lotionibus ceteris leviticis". Similarly Winer (*Gramm.*, p. 240): "If we render **βαπτ. διδ.** *baptisms of doctrine or instruction*, as distinguished from the legal baptisms (washings) of Judaism, we find a support for this designation, as characteristically Christian, in Matt. xxviii. 19, **βαπτίσαντες αὐτούς . . . διδάσκοντες αὐτούς**". It is better to take the words as equivalent to **διδαχῆς περὶ βαπτισμῶν.** In N.T. **βάπτισμα** is regularly used of Christian baptism or of John's baptism, while **βαπτισμός** is used of ceremonial washings as in ix. 10 and Mk. vii. 4. [*Cf.* Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 62. Josephus,

χειρῶν, ἀναστάσεώς τε[1] νεκρῶν, καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου. 3. [a]καὶ[a] τοῦτο ποιήσομεν,[2] ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ Θεός. 4. [b]Ἀδύνατον γὰρ

[a] Acts xviii. 21; 1 Cor. iv. 19; Jac. iv. 15.

[b] x. 26; Matt. xii. 31, 45; Joan, iv. 10; 2 Peter ii. 20; 1 Joan v. 16.

[1] τε in ℵACDᶜEKL, vg.; omitted in BD gr. P, and rightly rejected by Tr., WH and Weiss.

[2] T.R. in ℵBKLN, 17, d, e, f, vg., etc.; ποιησωμεν in ACDEP, Arm. The indicative agrees better with ἐάνπερ, κ.τ.λ.

(*Ant.*, xviii. 5, 2) uses βαπτισμός of John's baptism.] Probably, therefore, "teaching about washings" would include instruction in the distinction between the various Jewish washings, John's baptism and that of Christ (*cf.* Acts xix. 2); and this would involve instruction in the cleansing efficacy of the Atonement made by Christ as well as in the work of the Holy Spirit. It was very necessary for a convert from Judaism to understand the difference between symbolic and real lustration. The reference of the plural must, therefore, not be restricted to the distinction of outward and inward baptism (Grotius), nor of water and spirit baptism (Reuss) nor of infant and adult baptism, nor of the threefold immersion nor, as Primasius, "pro varietate accipientium". ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν closely conjoined to the foregoing by τε because the "laying on of hands" was the accompaniment of baptism in Apostolic times. "As through baptism the convert became a member of the House of God, through the laying on of hands he received endowments fitting him for service in the house, and an earnest of his relation to the world to come (vi. 5)" (Davidson, *cf.* Delitzsch). The laying on of hands was normally accompanied by prayer. Prayer was the essential element in the transaction, the laying on of hands designating the person to whom the prayer was to be answered and for whom the gift was designed. *Cf.* Acts xix. 1-6; viii. 14-17; xiii. 3; vi. 6; and Lepine's *The Ministers of Jesus Christ*, p. 141-4. In Apostolic times baptism apparently meant that the baptised believed in and gave himself to Christ, while the laying on of hands meant that the Holy Ghost was conferred upon him. In baptism as now administered both these facts are outwardly represented. ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου: "resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment," "constituting the believer's outlook under which he was to live" (Davidson). The genitives depend on διδαχῆς, not on θεμέλιον, as Vaughan. The phrase ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν naturally includes all the dead both righteous and unrighteous (see John v. 29 and Acts xxiv. 15. κρίμα though properly the result of κρίσις is not always distinguished from it, see John ix. 39; Acts xxiv. 25; and *cf.* Heb. ix. 27). It is "eternal," timeless in its results. These last-named doctrines, although not specifically Christian, yet required to be brought before the notice of a Jewish convert that he might disentangle the Christian idea from the Jewish Messianic expectation of a resurrection of Israel to the enjoyment of the Messianic Kingdom, and of a judgment on the enemies of Israel (*Cf.* Weiss).

Ver. 3. καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν: "and this will we do," that is, we will go on to perfection and not attempt again to lay a foundation. So Theoph.: τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φέρεσθαι. And Primasius: "et hoc faciemus, *i.e.*, et ad majora nos ducemus, et de his omnibus quae enumeravimus plenissime docebimus nos, ut non sit iterum necesse ex toto et a capite ponere fundamentum". Hofmann refers the words to the participial clause, an interpretation adopted even by von Soden ["nämlich abermal Fundament Einsenken"] which only creates superfluous difficulty. The writer, feeling as he does the arduous nature of the task he undertakes, adds the condition, ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ Θεός, "if God permit". The addition of περ has the effect of limiting the condition or of indicating a *sine qua non*; and may be rendered "if only," "if at all events," "if at least". This clause is added not as if the writer had any doubt of God's willingness, but because he is conscious that his success depends wholly on God's will. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 7.

Vv. 4-6 give the writer's reason for not attempting again to lay a foundation. It is, he says, to attempt an impossibility. The statement falls into three parts: (1) A description of a class of persons τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας . . . καὶ παραπεσόντας. (2) The statement of a fact re-

garding these persons **ἀδύνατον πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν.** (3) The cause of this fact found in some further characteristics of their career **ἀνασταυροῦντας . . . παραδειγματίζοντας.**

Ver. 4. First, the description here given of those who have entered upon the Christian life is parallel to the description given in vv. 1, 2 of elementary Christian teaching; although the parallel is not carried out in detail. The picture, though highly coloured, is somewhat vague in outline. "The writer's purpose is not to give information to *us*, but to awaken in the breasts of his first readers sacred memories, and breed godly sorrow over a dead past. Hence he expresses himself in emotional terms such as might be used by recent converts rather than in the colder but more exact style of the historian" (Bruce). **ἀδύνατον γὰρ** : The **γὰρ** does not refer to the immediately preceding clause (Delitzsch) but points directly to **τοῦτο ποιήσομεν** and through these words to **ἐπὶ τὴν τελ. φερώμεθα,** the sense being "Let us go on to perfection and not attempt to lay again a foundation, *for* this would be vain, seeing that those who have once begun and found entrance to the Christian life, but have fallen away, cannot be renewed again to repentance, cannot make a second beginning. **τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας,** "those who were once enlightened". **τοὺς** includes all the participles down to **παραπεσόντας,** which therefore describe one class of persons; and it is governed by **ἀνακαινίζειν. ἅπαξ**: "once for all" *semel* (not **πότε** = quondam) may be taken as remotely modifying the three following participles as well as **φωτισθ.** Its force is that "once" must be enough; no **πάλιν** can find place; and it refers back to **πάλιν** of ver. 1, and forward to **πάλιν** of ver. 6. **φωτισθέντας** is used in this absolute way in x. 32 where a comparison with ver. 26 indicates that it is equivalent to **τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας.** *Cf.* also 2 Cor. iv. 4 and Eph. i. 18. The source of the enlightenment is **τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον,** the result is repentance and faith, ver. 1. Hatch refers to this passage in support of his contention that the language and imagery of the N.T. are influenced by the Greek mysteries (*Hibbert Lect.*, pp. 295-6). "So early as the time of Justin Martyr we find a name given to baptism which comes straight from the Greek mysteries —the name 'enlightenment' (**φωτισμός, φωτίζεσθαι**). It came to be the constant technical term." But as Anrich shows (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 125) **φωτισμός** was not one of the technical terms of the mysteries ["Der Ausdruck **φωτισμός** begegnet in der Mysterienterminologie nie und nirgends".] The word is of frequent occurrence in the LXX, see esp. Hos. x. 12. **φωτίσατε ἑαυτοὺς φῶς γνώσεως** ["Ausdruck und Vorstellung sind alttestamentlich"]. Of course it is the fact that **φωτισμός** was used by Justin and subsequent fathers to denote baptism (*vide* Suicer, s.v.), and several interpret the word here in that sense. So the Syrian versions; Theodoret and Theophylact translate by **βάπτισμα** and **λουτρόν.** For the use made of this translation in the Montanist and Novatian controversies see the Church Histories, and Tertullian's *De Pudic.*, c. xx. The translation is, however, an anachronism. [In this connection, the whole of c. vi. of Clement's *Paedag.* may with advantage be read. **ἐφωτίσθημεν· τὸ δ' ἐστιν ἐπιγνῶναι τὸν Θεόν. . . . Βαπτιζόμενοι φωτιζόμεθα· φωτιζόμενοι υἱοποιούμεθα· υἱοποιούμενοι τελειούμεθα.**]

γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου, "and tasted the heavenly gift". **γευσαμ.** here as elsewhere, to know experimentally; *cf.* ii. 9; Matt. xvi. 29. The heavenly gift, or the gift that comes to us from heaven and partakes of the nature of its source, is according to Chrys. and Œcum: "The forgiveness of sins"; and so, many moderns, Davidson, Weiss, etc.; others with a slight difference refer it to the result of forgiveness "pacem conscientiae quae consequitur peccatorum remissionem" (Grotius). Some finding that **δωρεά** is more than once (Acts ii. 38, x. 45) used of the Holy Spirit, conclude that this is here the meaning (Owen, von Soden, etc.); while Bengel is not alone in rendering, "Dei filius, ut exprimitur (ver. 6.) *Christus*, qui per fidem, nec non in sacra ipsius Coena gustatur". Bleek, considering that this expression is closely joined to the preceding by **τε,** concludes that what is meant is the gift of enlightenment, or, as Tholuck says, "the **δωρεά** is just the Christian **φῶς** objectively taken". The objection to the first of these interpretations, which has much in its favour, is that it is too restricted: the last is right in emphasising the close connection with **φωτισθ.,** for what is meant apparently is the whole gift of redemption, the new creation, the fulness of life eternal freely bestowed, and

τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου, καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, 5. καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους

made known as freely bestowed to the "enlightened". *Cf.* Rom. v. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 15. **καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας Πνεύματος Ἁγίου,** "and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost"; a strong expression intended to bring out, as Westcott remarks, "the fact of a personal character gained; and that gained in a vital development". The bestowal of the Spirit is the invariable response to faith. The believer is **πνευματικός.** In chap. x. 29, when the same class of persons is described, one element of their guilt is stated to be their doing despite to the Spirit of grace. Grotius and others refer the words to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; rather it is the distinctive source of Chris ian life that is meant. It is customary to find a parallel between the two clauses of ver. 2, **βαπτ. διδ. ἐπιθέσ. τε χειρῶν** and the two clauses of this verse **γευσαμ. καὶ μετόχους.** There are, however, objections to this idea.

Ver. 5. **καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους . . .** "and tasted God's word that it is good". **ῥήματα καλά** in LXX (*vide* Josh. xxi. 43) are the rich and encouraging promises of God, *cf.* Zech. i. 13, **ῥήματα καλὰ καὶ λόγους παρακλητικούς.** Here it probably means the Gospel in which all promise is comprehended; *cf.* 1 Pet. i. 25, **ῥῆμα Κυρίου . . . τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.** Persons then are here described who have not only heard God's promise, but have themselves tasted or made trial of it and found it good. They have experienced that what God proclaims finds them, in their conscience with its resistless truth, in their best desires by quickening and satisfying them. The change from the genitive, **δωρεᾶς,** to the accusative, **ῥῆμα,** after **γευσ.** is variously accounted for. Commonly, verbs of sense take the accusative of the nearer, the genitive of the remoter source of the sensation; but probably the indiscriminate use of the two cases in LXX and N.T. arises from the tendency of the accusative in later Greek to usurp the place of the other cases. Yet it is not likely that so careful a stylist as our author should have altered the case without a reason. That reason is best given by Simcox (*Gram.*, p. 87), "**γενέσθαι** in Heb. vi. 4 5, has the genitive, where it is merely a verb of sense, the accusative where it is used of the recognition of a fact—**καλόν** being (as its position shows) a predicate". With this expression may be compared Prov. xxxi. 18, **ἐγεύσατο ὅτι καλόν ἐστι τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι.** Bengel's idea that the genitive indicates that a part, while accusative that the whole was tasted, may be put aside. Also Hofmann's idea, approved by Weiss, that the accusative is employed to avoid an accumulation of genitives. **δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος** "and [tasted] the powers of the age to come" [that they were good, for **καλάς** may be supplied out of the **καλόν** of the preceding clause; or the predicate indicating the result of the tasting may be taken for granted]. **δυνάμεις** is so frequently used of the powers to work miracle imparted by the Holy Spirit (see ii. 4, 1 Cor. xii. 28; 2 Cor. xii. 12; and in the Gospels *passim*) that this meaning is generally accepted as appropriate here. See Lünemann. **αἰὼν μέλλων** is therefore here used not exactly as in Matt. xii. 32, Eph. i. 21 where it is contrasted with this present age or world, but rather as the temporal equivalent of the **οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα** of chap. ii. 5, *cf.* also ix. 11, x. 1.; and Bengel's note. It is the Messianic age begun by the ministry of Christ, but only consummated in His Second Advent. A wider reference is sometimes found in the words, as by Davidson: "Though the realising of the promises be yet future, it is not absolutely so; the world to come projects itself in many forms into the present life, or shows its heavenly beauty and order rising up amidst the chaos of the present. This it does in the powers of the world to come, which are like laws of a new world coming in to cross and by and by to supersede those of this world. Those "powers," being mainly still future, are combined with the good word of promise, and elevated into a distinct class, corresponding to the third group above, *viz.*: resurrection and judgment (ver. 2)." The persons described have so fully entered into the spirit of the new time and have so admitted into their life the powers which Christ brings to bear upon men, that they can be said to have "tasted" or experienced the spiritual forces of the new era.

Ver. 6. **καὶ παραπεσόντας,** "and fell away," *i.e.*, from the condition depicted

Θεοῦ ῥῆμα, 6. δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν

by the preceding participles; "grave verbum subito occurrens" (Bengel). The word in classical Greek has the meaning "fall in with" or "fall upon"; in Polybius, "to fall away from," "to err," followed by **τ. ὁδοῦ, τ. ἀληθείας, τ. καθήκοντος**; also absolutely "to err". In the Greek fathers the lapsed are called **οἱ παραπεπτωκότες** or **οἱ παραπεσόντες.** The full meaning of the word is given in **ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν** of x. 39. The translation of the A.V. and early English versions "if they shall fall away," although accused of dogmatic bias, is justifiable. It is a hypothesis that is here introduced. Thus far the writer has accumulated expressions which present the picture of persons who have not merely professed the Christian faith but have enjoyed rich experience of its peculiar and characteristic influence, but now a word is introduced which completely alters the picture. They have enjoyed all these things, but the last thing to be said of them is that they have "fallen from" their former state. The writer describes a condition which he considers possible. And of persons realising this possibility he says **ἀδύνατον . . . πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν,** "it is impossible to renew [them] again to repentance," "impossible," not "difficult" [as in the Graeco-Latin Codex Claromontanus, "difficile"]; impossible not only to a teacher, but to God, for in every case of renewal it is God who is the Agent. [Bengel says "hominibus est impossibile, non Deo," and that therefore the ministers of God must leave such persons to Him and wait for what God may accomplish "per singulares afflictiones et operationes". But *cf.* x. 26-31.] **πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν, πάλιν** is not pleonastic, but denotes that those who have once experienced **ἀνακαινισμός** cannot again have a like experience. It suggests that the word **ἀνακαιν.** involves, or naturally leads on to, all that is expressed in the participles under **ἅπαξ** from **φωτισθέντας** to **αἰῶνος** of ver. 5. A renewed person is one who is enlightened, tastes the heavenly gift, and so on. But as the first stone in the foundation was **μετάνοια** (ver. 1), so here the first manifestation of renewal is in **μετάνοια.** The persons described cannot again be brought to a life-changing repentance—a statement which opens one of the most important psychological problems. The reason this writer assigns for the impossibility is given in the words **ἀνασταυροῦντας . . . παραδειγματίζοντας,** "crucifying [or "seeing that they crucify"] to themselves the Son of God, and putting Him to open shame". Edwards understands these participles as putting a hypothetical case, and renders "they cannot be renewed after falling away if they persist in crucifying, etc.". This, however, reduces the statement to a vapid truism, and, although grammatically admissible, does not agree with the **οὐκέτι** of the parallel passage in x. 26. The mitigation of the severity of the statement is rather to be sought in the enormity and therefore rarity of the sin described, which is equivalent to the deliberate and insolent rejection of Christ alluded to in x. 26, 29, and the suicidal blasphemy alluded to in Mk. iii. 29. On the doctrine of the passage, see Harless, *Ethics*, c. 29. In classical and later Greek the word for "crucify" is not **σταυρόω** (of which Stephanus cites only one example, and that from Polybius), but **ἀνασταυροῦν,** so that the **ἀνα** does not mean "again" or "afresh," but refers to the lifting *up* on the cross, as in **ἀναρτάω** or **ἀνασκολοπίζω.** In the N.T. no doubt **σταυρόω** is uniformly used, but never in this Epistle; and it was inevitable that a Hellenist would understand **ἀνασταυρ.** in its ordinary meaning. There is no ground therefore for the translation of the Vulg. "rursum crucifigentes," although it is so commonly followed. Besides, any crucifixion by the Hebrews [**ἑαυτοῖς**] must have been a *fresh crucifixion*, and needs no express indication of that feature of it. The significance of **ἑαυτοῖς** seems to be "so far as they are concerned," not "to their own judgment" or "to their own destruction". The apostate crucifies Christ on his own account by virtually confirming the judgment of the actual crucifiers, declaring that he too has made trial of Jesus and found Him no true Messiah but a deceiver, and therefore worthy of death. The greatness of the guilt in so doing is aggravated by the fact that apostates thus treat **τὸν υἱὸν τ. Θεοῦ,** *cf.* x. 29. **καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας,** the verb is found in Numb. xxv. 4, where it implies ex-

τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας. 7. γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιοῦσα τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς πολλάκις ἐρχόμενον ὑετὸν, καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὔθετον ἐκείνοις δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται, μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ· 8. ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους, ἀδόκιμος καὶ κατά-

posing to ignominy or infamy, such as was effected in barbarous times by exposing the quarters of the executed criminal, or leaving him hanging in chains. Archilochus, says Plutarch (*Moral.*, 520), rendered himself infamous, **ἑαυτὸν παρεδειγ.**, by writing obscene verses. The verb is therefore a strong expression; "put Him to open shame" excellently renders it. "This was the crime the Hebrew Christians were tempted to commit. A fatal step it must be when taken; for men who left the Christian Church and went back to the synagogue became companions of persons who thought they did God service in cursing the name of Jesus" (Bruce).

Vv. 7 and 8 present an analogy in nature to the doom of the apostate.

Ver. 7. **γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιοῦσα . . . ὑετόν,** "For land which drank in the rain that cometh oft upon it"; this whole clause is the subject of vv. 7 and 8; the subject remains the same, the results are different. It might almost be rendered, in order to bring out the emphasis on **γῆ,** "For, take the case of land". Such constructions are well explained by Green (*Gram.*, 34): "The anarthrous position of the noun may be regarded as employed to give a prominence to the peculiar meaning of the word without the interference of any other idea, while the words to which the article is prefixed, limit by their fuller and more precise description the general notion of the anarthrous noun, and thereby introduce the determinate idea intended." The comparison of human culture with agriculture is common. *Cf.* especially Plut., *De Educ. Puer.*, c. 3; and the remarkable lines of the *Hecuba*, 590-596. To make the comparison with the persons described in vv. 4, 5 apt, the advantageous conditions of the land are expressed in **ἡ πιοῦσα κ.τ.λ.** The abundant and frequently renewed rain represents the free and reiterated bestowal of spiritual impulse; the enlightenment, the good word of God, the energetic indwelling of the Holy Spirit, which the Hebrews had received and which should have enabled them to bring forth fruit to God. **πιοῦσα,** as in Anacreon's **ἡ γῆ μέλαινα πίνει,** and Virgil's (*Ecl.* iii. 3) "sat prata biberunt". Bengel's note, "non solum in superficie" brings out the meaning. The aorist expressing a completed past contrasts with **τίκτουσα** and **ἐκφέρουσα** continuous presents. **καὶ τίκτουσα . . . γεωργεῖται,** "and produces herbage meet for those on whose account also it is tilled". This is one of the possible results of the natural advantage. **τίκτουσα βοτάνη** are found in classic Greek. See examples in Wetstein and Bleek. **εὔθετον** originally "conveniently situated" and hence "suitable" "fit" as in Luke ix. 62. **ἐκείνοις** follows **εὔθετον,** not **τίκτουσα.** The measure of a field's value is its satisfying the purpose of those on whose account it is tilled. **δι' οὓς,** "for whose sake" or "on whose account," not, as Calvin, "quorum opera"; not the labourers, but the owners are intended or those whom the owners mean to supply. **καὶ γεωργεῖται, καὶ** introduces a consideration which "brings into relief the naturalness of the **τίκτειν βοτάνην εὔθετον ἐκείνοις**" (Lünemann). Westcott seems to lean to Schlichting's explanation: "The laborious culture of the soil seems to be contrasted with its spontaneous fruitfulness". *Cf.* the "justissima tellus" of Vergil, *Georg.* ii. 460. Land so responding to the outlay put upon it **μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ,** "partakes of a blessing from God". God's approval is seen in the more and more abundant yield of the land. The reality here colours the figure.

Ver. 8. **ἐκφέρουσα δὲ . . .** "but if it brings forth thorns and thistles it is rejected and nigh unto a curse and its end is burning". The other alternative, which corresponds to the possible state of the Hebrews, is here introduced. With all its advantages, the land may prove disappointing, may not stand the sole test (**ἀδόκιμος**) of land, its production of a harvest. **ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβ.** frequently conjoined in LXX, Gen. iii. 17, Hos. x. viii, and expressive of useless and noxious products. [**τρίβολος,** frequently **τριβελής,** three pointed, and originally meaning a caltrop]. **ἀδόκιμος** is used under the influence of the personal reference rather than of the

c Prov. xiv. 31; Matt. x. 42, et xxv. 40; Marc. ix. 41; Joan. xiii. 20; Rom. iii. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. i. 6, 7.

ρας ἐγγὺς, ἧς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν. 9. Πεπείσμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀγαπητοὶ, τὰ κρείττονα[1] καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας, εἰ καὶ οὕτω λαλοῦμεν. 10. [c] οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν, καὶ τοῦ κόπου[2] τῆς ἀγάπης ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, διακονήσαντες

[1] **κρεισσονα** is better authenticated than **κρειττονα.**

[2] T.R. in DcE**KL, Copt., Chrys., Thdrt., a gloss from 1 Thess. i. 3; **του κοπου** omitted in ℵABCD*E*P, d, e, f, vg., Basm., Syr., Arm., Aeth.

figure. **κατάρας ἐγγύς** with a reference to Gen. iii. 18 **ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ,** and suggested by the **εὐλογίας** of the previous verse. Wetstein quotes from Aristides the expression **κατάρας ἐγγύς,** and from the **ἐγγύς** Chrys. and Theophyl. conclude, rightly, that the curse is not yet in action. **ὁ γὰρ ἐγγὺς κατάρας δυνήσεται καὶ μακρὰν γενέσθαι. ἧς τὸ τέλος.** What is the antecedent? **γῆ,** say the Geeek commentaries, Bengel, Riehm, Delitzsch, Lünemann, Alford; **κατάρας,** say Stuart, Bleek, Weiss, von Soden. The former seems distinctly preferable. *Cf.* Phil. iii. 19, **ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια.** But here it is **εἰς καῦσιν** instead of **καῦσις** "for burning," it serves for nothing else, and is thus contrasted with the use served by the productive land. The burning has with an excess of literality been ascribed to the soil itself, and therefore the example of Sodom and Gomorrah has been adduced. But Grotius is right who finds a metonymy: "de terra dicitur quod proprie iis rebus convenit quae terrae superstant". Reference may be made to Philo, *De Agric.* c. 4: **ἐπικαύσω καὶ τὰς ῥίζας αὐτῶν ἐφιεῖσ' ἄχρι τῶν ὑστάτων τῆς γῆς φλογὸς ῥιπήν.** *Cf.* John xv. 6. Certainly it points not to a remedial measure, but to a final destructive judgment.

Verses 9-12, sudden transition, characteristic of the author, from searching warning to affectionate encouragement. "Startled almost by his own picture" he hastens to assure the Hebrews that he is convinced it does not represent their present condition. On the contrary he recognises in their loving care of Christ's people a service God cannot overlook and which involves "salvation". They have only to abound in hope as already they are rich in love, and they will no longer be slothful and inanimate but will reproduce in their lives the faith and endurance which have brought others into the enjoyment of the promised and eternal blessing.

Ver. 9. **πεπείσμεθα δὲ. . . .** "But of you, beloved, we are persuaded things that are better and associated with salvation, though we thus speak." "Alarm at the awful suggestion of his own picture (vv. 4-8) causes a rush of affection into his heart" (Davidson). He hastens to assure them that he does not consider them apostates, although he has described the apostate condition and doom. "This is very like St. Paul's way of closing and softening anything he had said that sounded terrible and dreadful" (Pierce). *Cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 13; Eph. iv. 20; Gal. v. 10. "The form [**πεπείσμεθα**] implies that the writer had felt misgivings and overcome them" (Westcott). **περὶ ὑμῶν** is emphasised, and the unique (in this Epistle) **ἀγαπητοί** is introduced to reassure them and as the natural expression of his own reaction in their favour. **τὰ κρείττονα** "things better" than those he has been describing (neither limiting the reference to the condition, although necessarily it is mainly in view, nor to the doom, although the **σωτηρίας** indicates that it also is in view); and things indeed that so far from being **κατάρας ἐγγύς** are **ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας** closely allied to salvation. [*Cf.* Hamlet's "no relish of salvation in it."] **ἐχόμενα** = next, from **ἔχομαι.** I hold myself to, adhere. So locally Mark i. 38, **εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις**: temporally, Acts xxi. 26, **τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμερᾷ,** here, as in Herodotus, Plato, and Lucian, "pertaining to," so Herod., i. 120, **τὰ τῶν ὀνειράτων ἐχόμενα. εἰ καὶ** and **καὶ εἰ** generally retain in N.T. their distinctive meanings.

Ver. 10. **οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος. . . .** "For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and the love which ye shewed toward His name in that ye ministered and still do minister to the saints." He recognises in their Christian activities (**ἔργου ὑμῶν**) and in their practical charities (**τῆς ἀγάπης**) things that are associated with salvation, because God's justice demands that such service shall

σαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες. 11. ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους· 12. ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε, μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας.

not be overlooked. God will bless the field which already has yielded good fruit. He will cherish Christian principle in those that have manifested it. To him that hath shall be given. *Cf.* especially Phil. i. 6. On the doctrinal bearing of the words, see Tholuck in *loc.* It is impossible to think of God looking with indifference upon those who serve Him or affording them no help or encouragement. **τῆς ἀγάπης ἧς . . .** the love which found expression in personal service (**διακονήσαντες**) to Christians (**ἁγίοις**), and of which examples are specified in x. 34, was love **εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,** because it was prompted not by natural relationship or worldly association but by the consideration that they were God's children and people.

Ver 11. **ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ. . . .** You have manifested earnest *love,* cultivate as earnestly your *hope;* that is what I desire. The translation should therefore be "*But* we desire". **ἕκαστον ὑμῶν,** "each one of you," not merely as Chrysostom interprets **πολλὴ ἡ φιλοστοργία· καὶ μεγάλων καὶ μικρῶν ὁμοίως κήδεται,** not as Bruce, "The good shepherd goeth after even one straying sheep"; but directly in contrast to the whole body and *general* reputation of the Church addressed. The writer courteously implies that some already showed the zeal demanded; but he desires that each individual, even those whose condition prompted the foregoing warning, should bestir themselves. *Cf.* Bengel's "non modo, ut adhuc fecistis, in communi". **τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν . . . τέλους.** The same earnest diligence [**σπουδή** in exact opposition to **νωθροί** of v. 11, vi. 12] which had been given to loving ministries, he desires they should now exercise towards a corresponding perfectness of hope—a hope which should only disappear in fruition. **πληροφορία** "hic non est *certitudo,* sed *impletio* sive *consummatio,* quo sensu **πληροφ.** habemus, Col. ii. 2, *et* 1 Thess. i. 5, **πληροφορεῖν** 2 Tim. iv. 5, 17" (Grotius). Alford insists that the subjective sense of the word is uniform in N.T. and therefore translates "the full assurance". But the objective meaning, "completeness," certainly suits Col. ii. 2 **πᾶν τὸ πλοῦτος τ. πληροφορίας τ. συνέσεως** and is not unsuitable in Heb. x. 22 and 1 Thess. i. 5, while the verb **πληροφορεῖν,** at least in some passages, as 2 Tim. iv. 5, has an objective sense. Besides, in the case before us, the one meaning involves the other, for, as Weiss himself says, hope is only then what it ought to be when a full certainty of conviction (eine volle Ueberzeugungsgewissheit) accompanies it. See also Davidson, who says "fulness or full assurance of faith and hope is not anything distinct from faith and hope, lying outside of them and to which they may lead; it is a condition of faith and hope themselves, the perfect condition". **ἄχρι τέλους** the hope was to be perfect in quality and was also to be continuous "to the end," *i.e.*, until it had accomplished its work and brought them to the enjoyment of what was hoped for. The words attach themselves to **ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδήν.**

Ver. 12. **ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε**: "that ye become not sluggish," "be not, misses the fine delicacy of the writer" (Alford). "The **γένησθε,** pointing to the future, stands in no contradiction with **γεγόνατε** at v. 11. There, the sluggishness of the intellect was spoken of; here, it is sluggishness in the retaining of the Christian hope" (Lünemann). Sluggishness would result if they did not "manifest diligence". **μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν . . .**: "but imitators of those who, through faith and patient waiting, are now inheriting the promises". The positive aspect of the conduct that should accompany cultivation of hope. They were not the first who had launched into that apparently shoreless ocean. Others before them had crossed it, and found solid land on the other side. There are many who are fairly described as **κληρον. τὰς ἐπαγγελίας.** Whether alive or now dead, they have entered on possession of that good thing which they could not see but which God had promised. Alford, apparently following Peirce, denies that **κληρονομούντων** can mean "who are inheriting," and renders "who are inheritors". To this conclusion he is led, as also Peirce, by the consideration that in c. xi. it is said of

d Gen. xii. 3, et xvii. 4, et xxii. 16, 17; Ps. cv. 9; Luc. i. 73.

13. [d] **Τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ Θεὸς, ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς εἶχε μείζονος ὀμόσαι, ὤμοσε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ,** 14. **λέγων, "Ἦ μὴν**[1] **εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε, καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε".** 15. **καὶ οὕτω**

[1] T.R. in KL*, al pler and Greek fathers; **εἰ μην** in ℵABD*EP, 17, 23, 31, 47*, 71, 137; **ει μη** in CDbLcon, d, e, f., vg., Ambr., Primas. *nisi*. Bleek is of opinion that **εἰ μήν** is a corrupt form resulting from the mixture of the classical **ἢ μήν** and the Hebraizing **εἰ μή**. But Deissmann (*Neue Bibelstud.*, p. 34) adduces examples of **εἰ μήν** from the Papyri, which prove that it is not a merely Biblical form.

Abraham and the other heroes of faith that they did not receive the promise. But it is also indicated in the same passage that by the coming of Christ the fulness of the promise was fulfilled. It was only "without us" of the Christian period that the patriarchs were imperfect. Those who are presently enjoying the promises attained their present victory and joy, **διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας.** Necessarily, they first had to believe the promises, but faith had to be followed up by patient waiting. Alford translates **μακροθ.** by "endurance," but this word rather represents **ὑπομονή,** while **μακροθ.** indicates the long-drawn-out patience which is demanded by hope deferred.

Vv. 13-20. Reasons for diligently cultivating hope and exercising patience, thus becoming imitators of those who have patiently waited for the fulfilment of the promises, the reasons being that God has made the failure of the promises impossible, and that already Jesus has passed within the veil as our forerunner.

Ver. 13. **Τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ. . . .** "For when God made promise to Abraham, since he could sware by none greater, He sware by Himself, saying, etc." Abraham is introduced because to him was made the fundamental and comprehensive promise (*cf.* Luke i. 73, and Gal. iii.) which involved all that God was ever to bestow. And in Abraham it is seen that the promise is secure, but that only by patient waiting can it be inherited. It is secure because God pledged Himself to perform it. The promise referred to in **ἐπαγγειλάμενος** seems to be that which was confirmed by an oath, and which is recorded in Gen. xxii. 16-18, **κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὤμοσα κ.τ.λ.** But Westcott prefers to consider that previous promises are referred to, as in Gen. xii. 3, 7, xiii. 14, xv. 5, xvii. 5. The aorist participle **ἐπαγγ.** admits of either construction. **ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς . . . ὀμνύω** followed by **κατά** as frequently in classics (Arist., *Frogs*, 94) and LXX, Isa. xlv. 23, Amos iv. 2, viii. 7, Zeph. i. 5, Matt. xxvi. 63. See references. **εἶχε . . . ὀμόσαι,** a classical use of **ἔχειν** from Homer downwards, "to have means or power to do," "to be able". The greater the Being sworn by, the surer the promise. *Cf.* Longinus, *De Subl.*, c. 16, on swearing by those who died at Marathon. **ὤμοσε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ,** how this oath was given, and how the knowledge of it was conveyed to men, this writer does not say. But it was somehow conveyed to the mind of Abraham that the fulfilment of this promise was bound up with the life of God; that it was so implicated with His purposes that God could as soon cease to be, as neglect the fulfilment of it. Lying as it did at the root of all further development, and marking out as it did the true end for which the world exists, it seemed to be bound up with the very being of God. Paul's way of expressing a similar idea is more congruous to our ways of looking at things, *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 20. *Cf.* Philo's discussion in *De Leg. Allegor.*, iii. 72, 3.

Ver. 14. The oath runs **εἰ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε. . . .** "Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee." "Sentences which denote assurance . . . are in classical Greek introduced by **ἢ μήν,** which in the Hellenistic and Roman period is sometimes written in the form of **εἰ** (accent ?) **μήν**; so in the LXX and in a quotation from it in Heb. vi. 14" (Blass, *Gram.*, p. 260); and *cf.* Jannaris, *Hist. Greek Gram.*, 2055. **μήν** is used to strengthen asseveration, suitably therefore in oaths. On the emphatic participle in imitation of the Hebrew absolute infinitive, see Winer, sec. 45, 8, p. 445. The oath here cited was a promise to bless mankind, a promise that through all history God's gracious purpose should run; that, let happen what might, God would redeem and bless the world.

Ver. 15. **καὶ οὕτω μακροθυμήσας . . .** "and thus having patiently waited he

μακροθυμήσας ἐπέτυχε τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. 16. [e] ἄνθρωποι μὲν[1] γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος ὀμνύουσι, καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὅρκος· 17. ἐν ᾧ περισσότερον βουλόμενος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιδεῖξαι τοῖς κληρονόμοις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς

e Exod. xxii. 11.

[1] Omit μεν with ℵABD*E*P, 47, d, e, f, vg.; T.R. in CDcE**KL, al pler, Cop., Aeth., Chr., Thdrt.

[Abraham] obtained the promise". **οὕτω,** in these circumstances; that is, thus upheld by a promise and an oath. The oath warned him of trial. It would not have been given had the promise been a trifling one or had it been destined for immediate fulfilment. **μακροθυμήσας,** having *long* kept up his courage and his hope. Delay followed delay; disappointment followed disappointment. He was driven out of the promised land, and a barren wife mocked the hope of the promised seed, but he waited expectant, and at length **ἐπέτυχε τῆς ἐπαγγελίας,** for although it was true of him, as of all O.T. saints, that he did *not* obtain the promise, [**μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας,** xi. 13; **οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν,** xi. 39], but could only wave his hand to it and salute it at a distance, yet the initial fulfilment he did see and was compensated for all his waiting by seeing the beginnings of that great history which ran on to the consummate performance of the promise in Christ. Bleek and Rendall understand by **ἐπέτυχε . . .** "obtained from God a promise of future blessing," and not the thing itself. But in this case **μακροθυμήσας** would be irrelevant. He had not to wait for the promise, but for its fulfilment.

Ver. 16. **ἄνθρωποι γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.** "For men swear by the greater." The procedure of God in confirming His promise by an oath is justified by human custom, and the confident hope which God's oath warrants is justified by the fact that even a human oath ends debate. **ἄνθρωποι** refers back to **ὁ Θεός** of ver. 13 and forward to ver. 17. **τοῦ μείζονος,** him who is greater than the persons taking the oath, the idea of an oath being that a higher authority is appealed to, one of inviolable truth and power to enforce it. **καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς . . .** "and of all gainsaying among them an oath is an end for confirmation". "The oath has two results negative and positive; it finally stops all contradiction; and it establishes that which it attests" (Westcott). On **βεβαίωσις** as a technical term, see Deissmann, *Bibl. Studies*, p. 104. **ἀντιλογία** is rendered by "strife" in A.V., and by "dispute" in R.V.; and this meaning is found in Exod. xviii. 16; Deut. xix. 17 **οἱ δύο ἄνθρωποι οἷς ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἡ ἀντιλογία.** But in the other instances of its use in N.T., Heb. vii. 7, xii. 3; Jud. xi., it has the meaning of "contradiction" or "gainsaying". So also in Polybius xxviii. 7, 4: **πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν ἀνίσταντο πολλοί.** It is this sense which suits the context here, as it is not a *strife* between God and man which is in question. Besides, **εἰς βεβαίωσιν** is more congruous with this meaning. The meaning is that when one man disputes the assertion of another, an oath puts an end to the contradiction and serves for confirmation. So Davidson, Westcott, Weiss, etc. **πάσης** is added not to indicate the universal deference paid to the oath (Bleek), but the completeness of its effect; no room is left for contradiction. **ὁ ὅρκος** the generic article, best translated "an oath". **πέρας** an end or limit, as in Ps. cxix.,96, **πάσης συντελείας εἶδον πέρας**; and Ps. cxlv. 3 **τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστι πέρας. εἰς βεβαίωσιν** almost in the technical sense of a guarantee. See Deissmann's interesting treatment of the word in *Bibelstud.*, pp. 100-104. On the verse Calvin remarks: "hic locus docet aliquem inter Christianos jurisjurandi usum esse legitimum. Quod observandum est contra homines fanaticos qui regulam sancte jurandi, quam Deus lege sua praescripsit, libenter abrogarent."

Ver. 17. **ἐν ᾧ περισσότερον. . . .** "Wherefore God, being minded more abundantly to demonstrate to the heirs of the promise the immutability of His purpose, interposed with an oath." **ἐν ᾧ = διὸ** (Theoph.), and see Winer, 484. It might be rendered "quae cum ita sint," or "this being so". The oath having among men this convincing power, God disregards the insult implied in any doubt of His word and condescending to human infirmity confirms

αὐτοῦ, ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, 18. ἵνα διὰ δύο πραγμάτων ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι Θεὸν, ἰσχυρὰν παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν οἱ καταφυγόντες κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος· 19. ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν

His promise by an oath. **περισσότερον** neuter adjective for adverb (ii. 1) is to be construed with **ἐπιδεῖξαι**, the meaning of the comparative being "abundantius quam s ne juramento factum videretur" (Bengel). Carpzov renders by "ex abundanti," and cites Philo, *De Abrahamo* c. 46 where the word of God is said to become an oath, **ἕνεκα τοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀκλινῶς καὶ παγίως ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ἐρηρεῖσθαι. τοῖς κληρονόμοις**, not exclusively the O.T. nor exclusively the N.T. heirs, neither Jews nor Gentiles, but a l; see ix. 3, and Gal. iii. 29. **τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ**, the unchangeable character of His purpose. [**ἀμετάθ.** 3 Macc. v. 1, 12; Polybius with **ἐπιβολή, ὁρμή, διάληψις.** For use of adjective see Rom. ii. 4, viii. 3; 1 Cor. i. 25, etc. Winer, p. 294.] **ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, μεσιτεύω**, belonging to later Greek, "to act as mediator," but sometimes used transitively "to negotiate," as in Polybius xi. 34, 3. Other examples in Bleek. Here, however, it is used intransitively as in Josephus, *Ant.*, vii. 8, 5. So the margin of A.V. "interposed himself by an oath," improved in R.V. "interposed with an oath". *Cf.* Josephus *Ant.*, iv. 6, 7; **ταῦτα δὲ ὀμνύοντες ἔλεγον καὶ θεὸν μεσίτην ὧν ὑπισχνοῦντο ποιούμενοι.** "God descended, as it were, from His own absolute exaltation, in order, so to speak, to look up to Himself after the manner of men and take Himself to witness; and so by a gracious condescension confirm the promise for the sake of its inheritors" (Delitzsch). "He brought in Himself as surety, He mediated or came in between men and Himself, through the oath by Himself" (Davidson).

Ver. 18. The motive of this procedure on God's part has already been indicated in **βουλόμενος**, but now it is more fully declared. **ἵνα διὰ δύο . . . ἐλπίδος** "that by two immutable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who fled for refuge to hold fast the hope set before us". The two immutable things are God's promise and His oath. It is impossible for God to break His promise, impossible also for him to falsify His oath. Both of these were given that even weak men might have strong encouragement. The emphasis is on **ἰσχυρὰν**, no ordinary encouragement. Interpreters are divided as to the construction of **κρατῆσαι**, Œcumenius, Bleek, Lünemann, and others maintaining its dependence on **παράκλησιν**, encouragement to hold fast the hope; while others, as Beza, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Weiss, construe it with **καταφυγόντες** as in A.V. "who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope". If this latter construction be not adopted, **καταφυγ.** is left undefined and must be taken in an absolute sense, which is unwarranted. It is the word used in the LXX (Deut. iv. 42, xix. 5; Josh. xx 9) for fleeing from the avenger to the asylum of the cities of refuge. So here Christians are represented as fleeing from the threatened danger and laying hold of that which promises safety. **κρατῆσαι** (aor. of single act) must therefore be rendered "to lay hold of" and not, as in iv. 14, "hold fast". The former meaning is much more frequent than the latter. **τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος**, the hope, that is, the object of hope is set before us as the city of refuge was set before the refugee and it is laid hold of by the hope it excites. **προκειμ.** is used of any object of ambition, "de praemiis laborum ac certaminum" (Wetstein, with examples). *Cf.* Col. i. 5, **τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.**

Ver. 19. **ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν . . .** "which [hope] we have as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast, and entering into that which is within the veil". An anchor was in ancient as well as in modern times the symbol of hope; see Aristoph., *Knights*, 1224 (1207) **λεπτή τις ἐλπίς ἐστ' ἐφ' ἧς ὀχούμεθα.** "A slender hope it is at which we ride," and Æsch., *Ag.*, 488: **πολλῶν ῥαγεισῶν ἐλπίδων** many hopes being torn away [like the flukes of anchors]. *Cf.* Paley in *loc.* Kypke quotes a saying attributed to Socrates: **οὔτε ναῦν ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀγκυρίου οὔτε βίον ἐκ μιᾶς ἐλπίδος ὁρμιστέον.** The symbol appears on ancient coins. **ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν**, unfailing and firmly fixed; negative and positive, it will not betray the confidence reposed in it but will hold firm. **ἀσφ. καὶ βεβ.**, Wisdom, vii. 23. Cebet., *Tab.*, 31. Bleek, Vaughan, Westcott, and

ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν, καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, 20. [f] ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν [f] iii. 1, et iv. 14, et viii. 1, et ix. 11. εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

others refer these adjectives to ἣν, not to ἄγκυραν. It seems much more natural to refer them with Chrys., Theoph., etc. to ἄγκυραν. *Cf.* Vulg.: "Quam sicut anchoram habemus animæ tutam ac firmam, et incedentem," and Weizsäcker "in der wir einen sicheren, festen Anker der Seele haben, der hineinreicht," etc. καὶ εἰσερχομένην . . . The anchor has its holding ground in the unseen. Some interpreters who refer the former two adjectives to the anchor, find so much strangeness or awkwardness in this term if so applied that they understand it directly of the hope itself. But as Davidson and Weiss show, the εἰσερχ. gives the ground of the two former adjectives; it is because the anchor enters into the eternal and unchangeable world that its shifting or losing hold is out of the question. (But *cf.* also ver. 16). No doubt the figure is now so moulded to conform to the reality that the physical reference is obscure, unless we think of a ship being warped into a harbour on an anchor already carried in. *Cf.* Weiss. That to which the figure points is obvious. It is in the very presence of God the anchor of hope takes hold. The Christian hope is fixed on things eternal, and is made sure by God's acceptance of it. [Alford quotes from Estius: "sicut ancora navalis non in aquis haeret, sed terram intrat sub aquis latentem, eique infigitur; ita ancora animæ spes nostra non satis habet in vestibulum pervenisse, id est, non est contenta bonis terrenis et visibilibus; sed penetrat usque ad ea, quae sunt intra velum, videlicet in ipsa sancta sanctorum; id est, Deum ipsum et coelestia bona apprehendit, atque in iis figitur".] τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, the holy of holies, the very presence of God. καταπέτασμα (in non-biblical Greek παραπέτασμα) is used in LXX of either of the two veils in the Temple (מָסָךְ or פָּרֹכֶת, Exod. xxvi. 37; Num. iii. 26; and Exod. xxvi. 31; Lev. iv. 6) but κάλυμμα, according to Philo, *De Vit. Mes.*, iii. 5, was the proper designation of the outer veil, καταπέτ. being reserved for the inner veil; and in this sense alone it is used in N.T. as ix. 3; Matt. xxvii. 51. See Carpzov in *loc.* and Kennedy's *Sources of N.T. Greek*, 113. τὸ ἐσώτερον τ. κ. is therefore the inmost shrine into which the Jewish worshipper could not enter but only the High Priest once a year. For the expression see Exod. xxvi. 33, etc.

Ver. 20. The holding-ground of the anchor of hope, the real presence of God, is further described in the words ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, "whither as forerunner for us entered Jesus". ὅποι does not occur in N.T. or LXX, ὅπου taking its place, as in English "where" often stands for "whither"; see Matt. viii. 19, Luke ix. 57, James iii. 4. So, too, occasionally, in Attic; examples in Bleek. πρόδρομος as an adjective, "running forward with headlong speed," see Jebb's note on Soph., *Antig.*, 107; as a substantive "scouts" or "advanced guard" of an army, Herodot., i. 60, and Wisdom xii. 8, ἀπέστειλάς τε προδρόμους τοῦ στρατοπέδου σου σφῆκας. The more general meaning is found in Num. xiii. 21, ἡμέραι ἔαρος, πρόδρομοι σταφυλῆς, Isa. xxviii. 4. The idea may be illustrated by ii. 10, Col. i. 18, 1 Cor. xv. 23. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν goes better with πρόδρομος—which requires further definition—than with εἰσῆλθεν, although Bleek, Weiss and others prefer to join it to the verb. Ἰησοῦς, the human name is used, because it is as man and having passed through the whole human experience that Jesus ascends as our forerunner. His superiority to the Levitical priest is disclosed in the word πρόδρομος. When the Levitical High Priest passed within the veil he went as the representative, not as the forerunner of the people. Hence indeed the veil. In Christ the veil is abolished. He enters God's presence as the herald and guarantee of our entrance. The ground of this is given in the concluding clause, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν . . . αἰῶνα, "having become [becoming] an High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek". Jesus carries our hope with Him to the realities which lie within the veil, because it is as our High Priest who has made atonement for sin that He is now at God's right hand. By His death He secured for us power to enter, to follow where He has gone before. The parti-

a Gen. xiv. 18, etc.

VII. 1. [a]ΟΥΤΟΣ γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ, βασιλεὺς Σαλὴμ, ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, ὃ [1] συναντήσας Ἀβραὰμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς

[1] T.R. only in C*LP, marked "suspected" by WH; ος in ℵABC²DEK, 17, apparently arising from the σ following, "ein für unseren Verf. unmögliches, völlig unmotivirtes Anakoluth" (Weiss). Alford accepts ος with the anacoluthon.

ciple does not determine the precise point at which He became High Priest, before or contemporaneously with His passing through the veil.

CHAPTER VII. The subject of Christ's priesthood is resumed; the interpolated admonition (v. 11-vi. 20) having been skilfully brought round to a second mention of Melchizedek. The chief reason for introducing the priesthood of Melchizedek as the type of Christ's priesthood was that it was "for ever". The Aaronic priesthood was successional, this single; and in this sense "for ever". There were, however, other reasons. The first question with a Jew who was enjoined to trust to Christ's priestly mediation, would be, What are His orders? He belonged to a tribe "of which Moses had spoken nothing concerning priesthood". He might or might not be the true heir to David's throne; but if He was, did not this very circumstance exclude him from the priestly office? Was it credible that the nation had been encouraged rigorously to exclude from the priesthood every interloper, only in order that at last this rigidly preserved order should be entirely disregarded? This writer seizes upon the fact that there was a greater priest than Aaron mentioned in Scripture—a priest more worthy to be the type of the Messianic priesthood, because he was himself a king, and especially because he belonged to no successional priestly order but was himself the entire order. This idea of a priesthood superseding that of Levi's sons found its way into Scripture through the hymn (Ps. cx.) which celebrated the dignity (as priest-king) of Simon the Maccabee. Bickell has shown that the first four verses of the Psalm are an acrostic on the name Simon, שמעון. When the Maccabees displaced the Aaronic priesthood, they found their justification in the priestly dignity of Melchizedek, and assumed his style, calling themselves "priests of the Most High God". *Cf.* Charles, *Book of Jubilees*, pp. lix. and 191. The chapter may be divided thus:—

I. Characteristics of Melchizedek, 1-10.
  1. In himself as depicted in Scripture, 1-3.
  2. In his relation to Levi and his line, 4-10.
II. Inadequacy of Levitical priesthood in comparison with the Melchizedek priesthood of Christ, 11-25.
  1. Levi being provisional, Melchizedek being permanent, 11-14.
  2. Official and hereditary: personal and eternal, 15-19.
  3. Without oath: with oath, therefore final, 20-22.
  4. Plural and successional: singular and enduring, 23-25.
III. Summary of the merits of the new Melchizedek Priest, Jesus.

Vv. 1-3. Description of Melchizedek as he appears on the page of Scripture, in five particulars with their interpretation.

Ver. 1. **Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ . . . μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.** **γὰρ** closely connects this passage with the immediately preceding words **ἀρχ. . . . αἰῶνα** and introduces the explanation of them. "For this Melchizedek [mentioned in Ps. cx. and who has just been named as that priest according to whose order Christ is called to be Priest] remains a priest continually." This is the statement on which he wishes to fix attention. It is the "for-everness" of the priesthood which he means especially to insist upon. The whole order is occupied by himself. This one man constitutes the order. He succeeds no one in office and no one succeeds him. In this sense he abides a priest for ever. Between the subject Melchizedek and the verb **μένει**, there are insertedfive historical facts taken from Gen. xiv., with their interpretation. [On the historicity of Gen. xiv., see Buchanan Gray in *Expositor*, May, 1898, and Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 45 and 73. See also Beazley's *Dawn of Modern Geography*, ii. 189; and esp., Boscawen's *First of Empires*, c. vi.] **βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ**, the description given in this verse is taken *verbatim* [with the needed

κοπῆς τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτόν· 2. ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραάμ· πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστι βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης·

grammatical alterations] from Gen. xiv. 17, 18, 19. Whether Salem stands for Jerusalem or for Salim in the vale of Shechem, John iii. 23, has been disputed from Epiphanius downwards. See Bleek, who contends that Jerusalem cannot be meant because Jebus was its old name. This, however, is now denied, see Moore, *Judges*, p. 413, who says that the common opinion that Jebus was the native name of the city, has no real ground in O.T. In the Amarna tablets *Urusalim* is used and no trace is found of any name corresponding to Jebus. But it is not the locality that is important, but the meaning of Salem. **ἱερεὺς . . .** "priest of the Most High God". According to Aristotle (*Pol.*, iii. 14), the king in heroic times was general, judge and priest. *Cf.* Virgil (*Æn.*, iii. 80) "Rex Anius, rex idem hominum, Phoebique sacerdos," and see Gardner and Jevon's *Greek Antiq.*, 200, 201. The ideal priesthood is also that of a king. **τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου.** In N.T. "the Most High God" is found in the mouth of Demoniacs, Mark v. 7; Luke viii. 28; *cf.* also Acts xvi. 17 and vii. 58, also Luke i. 32, 35, 70, vi. 35. It was a name known alike to the Canaanites, Phoenicians and Hebrews. See Fairbairn, *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, p. 317. **ὕψιστος** was also a title of **Ζεύς**, Pind., xi. 2. *Cf.* also Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 198; and especially Charles' edition of *Book of Jubilees*, pp. 191, 213, who shows that it was the specific title chosen by the Maccabean priest-kings. **ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς** "from the slaughter," rather "overthrow"; "Niederwerfung" (Weizsäcker); "*clades* rather than *caedes*" (Vaughan) translating in Genesis xiv. 17, מְדֹכַת. **τῶν βασιλέων** "the kings"; well-known from Gen. xiv., *viz.:* Amraphel, Arioch, Chedorlaomer and Tidal, *i.e.*, Khammurabi, Eriaku, Kudurlachgumal and Tudchula. But Boscawen (*First of Empires*, p. 179) disputes the identification of Amraphel with Khammurabi. The monuments show us that these kings were contemporaries two thousand three hundred years B.C., and furnish many interesting particulars regarding them; see Driver in *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 39-45. **καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτόν,** asserting thus at once his superiority (ver. 7) and his priestly authority.

Ver. 2. **ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην . . .** "to whom also Abraham divided a tenth of all" [the spoil]. The startling conclusion which this act carried with it is specified in vv. 4-10. The offering of a tithe of the spoils to the gods was a custom of antiquity. See Wetstein for examples and especially Arnold's note on Thucydides, iii. 50. "Frequently the **ἀναθήματα** were of the nature of **ἀπάρχαι**, or the divine share of what was won in peace or war. . . . The colossal statue of Athena Promachos on the Athenian Acropolis hill was a votive offering from a tithe of the booty taken at Marathon" (Gardner and Jevon's *Greek Ant.*, 181.) For the O.T. law of tithe see Num. xviii. 21-24; Lev. xxvii. 30-32. In offering to Melchizedek a tithe Abraham acknowledged him as priest.

The following clauses ought not to be in brackets, because they are inserted as indicating the ground of the main affirmation, **μένει εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.** The name and description of Melchizedek already given are now interpreted, and are so interpreted as to illustrate the clause **ἀφωμοιωμένος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ** and thus prepare for the closing statement. **πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος . . .** "being first, by interpretation, King of righteousness and then also King of Salem, which is King of peace". The form of the sentence is significant. [*Cf.* Plutarch, *Timoleon*, iv. 4, **τοῦ δὲ Τιμοφάνους πρῶτον μὲν αὐτῶν καταγελῶντος, ἔπειτα δὲ πρὸς ὀργὴν ἐκφερομένου**] "first" by his very name, "then" by his actual position; probably the peace of his kingdom is considered as a consequence of its righteousness. Righteousness and peace are characteristic properties of the Messianic Kingdom. "In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth," Ps. lxxii. 7; similarly Isa. ix. 6, 7; Zech. ix. 9; *cf.* Rom. v. 1; Eph. ii. 4, 15, 17. In Gen. xiv. 18 the name and title occur together מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֵם. The chief point in this is that the priest is also a king. **ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος** "without father, without mother, with-

3. ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος· μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν, μήτε
ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων· ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς
b Gen. xiv. 20. εἰς τὸ διηνεκές. 4. [b]Θεωρεῖτε δὲ πηλίκος οὗτος, ᾧ καὶ[1] δεκάτην

[1] T.R. in ℵACD^{c}E**KLP, vg., Syr^{r}, Arm.; omit και with BD*E*, d, e, Syr^{sch}, Cop. Apparently και has been introduced from verse 2.

out genealogy," that is, he stands in Scripture alone, no mention is made of an illustrious father or mother from whom he could have inherited power and dignity, still less can his priestly office and service be ascribed to his belonging to a priestly family. It is by virtue of his own personality he is what he is; his office derives no sanction from priestly lineage or hereditary rights; and in this respect he is made like to the Son of God. Of course it is not meant that in point of fact he had neither father nor mother, but that as he appears in Scripture he is without father. [τὸ δὲ ἀπάτωρ κ.τ.λ. οὐ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν αὐτὸν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ κατὰ τὸ φανερώτατον ἐπωνομάσθαι. Epiphanius in Wetstein.] On Philo's use of the silence of Scrip. see Siegfried's *Philo.*, p. 179. Philo is quite aware that this kind of interpretation will be said γλισχρολογίαν μᾶλλον ἢ ὠφέλειάν τινα ἐμφαίνειν (*De Somn.*, ii. 45). ἀπάτωρ, Wetstein quotes from Pollux.: ὁ μὴ ἔχων μητέρα, ἀμήτωρ, ὥσπερ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ· καὶ ἀπάτωρ, ὁ μὴ πατέρα ἔχων, ὡς ὁ Ἥφαιστος. So Apollo was αὐτοφυὴς, ἀμήτωρ. Other examples in Wetstein. In a slightly different sense the word occurs in *Iph. in Taur.*, 863; in Soph, *Elec.*, 1154 we have μήτηρ ἀμήτωρ; and Ion (Eur. *Ion*, 109) says of himself ὡς γὰρ ἀμήτωρ ἀπάτωρ τε γεγώς.

Ver. 3. ἀγενεαλόγητος, resolved in ver. 6 into μὴ γενεαλογούμενος, does not occur in classical nor elsewhere in Biblical Greek. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii. 64. μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν . . . "having neither beginning of days nor end of life," *i.e.*, again, as he is represented in Scripture. No mention is made of his birth or death, of his inauguration to his office or of his retirement from it. The idea is conveyed that so long as priestly services of that particular type were needed, this man performed them. He is thus the type of a priest who shall in his single person discharge for ever all priestly functions. ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τ. Θεοῦ "but made like to the Son of God". δὲ attaches this clause to the immediately preceding, "having neither etc.," *but* in this respect made like to the Son of God, see i. 2, ix. 14 and i. 10, 12. "Such a comparison is decisive against attributing these characteristics to Melchisedek in a real sense. They belong to the portrait of him, which was so drawn that he was "made like" the Son of God,—that by the features absent as well as by the positive traits a figure should appear corresponding to the Son of God and suited to suggest Him" (Davidson). μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές "abideth a priest continually". This statement, directly resting upon the preceding clause, is that towards which the whole sentence (vv. 1, 3) has been tending. It is the permanence of the Melchisedek priesthood on which stress is laid. See below. εἰς τὸ διηνεκές is not precisely "for ever," but "for a continuance," or permanence. Appian (*De Bell. civ.*, i. 4) says of Julius Cæsar that he was created Dictator εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, permanent Dictator. "The permanent character of the priesthood is here described, not its actual duration" (Rendall). It was not destined to be superseded by another. Bruce is not correct in saying: "The variation in expression (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές instead of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, vi. 20) is probably made out of regard to style, rather than to convey a different shade of meaning". But he gives the sense well: "If he had had in history, as doubtless he had in fact, a successor in office, we should have said of him, that he *was* the priest of Salem in the days of Abraham. As the case stands, he *is* the priest of Salem."

Vv. 4-10. Superiority of Melchizedek to Levitical priests. The argument is: he was greater than Abraham, the great fountain of the people and of blessing. How much more is he greater than the descendants of Abraham, the Levitical priests?

Ver. 4. Θεωρεῖτε δὲ πηλίκος οὗτος. "But observe how great this man was." His greatness is recognisable in his receiving tithes of Abraham, and in giving him his blessing, *cf.* vv. 1, 2. These

Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων ὁ πατριάρχης. 5. [c]καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες, ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαὸν κατὰ τὸν νόμον, τουτέστι, τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν, καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβραάμ· 6. [d]ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεα-

c Num. xviii. 21, 26; Deut. xviii. 1; Josh. xiv. 4; 2 Par. xxxi. 5.
d 1 Gen. xiv.19,20; Rom. iv. 13; Gal. iii. 16.

points are emphasised by several details. The first evidence of greatness is that it was no less a man than Abraham who gave him a tithe of the spoils ᾧ δεκάτην, κ.τ.λ. Ἀβραὰμ is in emphatic place, but the emphasis is multiplied by the position of ὁ πατριάρχης. It is as if he heard some of his readers saying, "He must be mistaken, or must refer to some other Abraham and not the fountain of all our families and of Levi and Aaron". He adds ὁ πατρ. to indicate that it is precisely this greatest of men to whom the people owe even their being, of whom he says that Melchizedek was greater. ἀκροθινίων is perhaps chosen also for the purpose of magnifying the gift. The Greeks after a victory gathered the spoils in a heap, θῖνι, and the top or best part of the heap, ἄκρον, was presented to the gods. *Cf.* Frazer's *Pausanias*, v. 281.

Ver. 5. The significance of this tithing is perceived when it is considered that, although the sons of Levi take tithes of their brethren, this is the result of a mere legal appointment. Those who pay tithes are, as well as those who receive them, sons of Abraham. Paying tithes is in their case no acknowledgment of personal inferiority, but mere compliance with law. But Abraham was under no such law to Melchizedek, and the payment of tithes to him was a tribute to his personal greatness. καὶ adds a fresh aspect of the matter. οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ . . . "those of the sons of Levi who receive the priestly service have an ordinance to tithe the people in accordance with the law, that is, their brethren, although these have come out of the loins of Abraham". Not all the tribe of Levi, but only the family of Aaron received (*cf.* v. 4) the ἱερατεία (also in Lk. i. 9), which Bleek shows to have been used by classical writers of priestly service, while ἱερωσύνη was used of the priestly office. See vv. 11, 12, 24. ἀποδεκατοῖν, "The best MSS. make the infinitive of verbs in -όω to end in -οῖν" (Westcott and Hort, *G., T.* ii., sec. 410, and *cf.* Jannaris, *Greek Gram.*, 851). The verb occurs only in Biblical Greek, the classical form being δεκατεύω. κατὰ τὸν νόμον follows ἀποδεκ. τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ. Not their fellow-Levites, although it is true that the Levites tithed the people, and the priests tithed the Levites (Num. xviii. 21-24 and 26-28), but the words are added in explanation of λαόν in order to emphasise the fact that the priests exacted tithes not in recognition of any personal superiority. Those who paid tithes were Abraham's descendants equally with the priests; it was merely the law which conveyed the right to tithe their brethren καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβραάμ.

Ver. 6. In striking contrast, ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος . . . "but he whose genealogy is not counted from them hath taken tithes of Abraham, and blessed [see below] him that hath the promises". γενεαλογέω is classical Greek, meaning, to trace ancestry, see Herod. ii. 146. ἐξ αὐτῶν, not "from the sons of Israel" (Epiphanius in Bleek), but "from the sons of Levi," ver. 5; and who therefore had no claim to tithe appointed by law, and yet tithed Abraham. καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα, in Vulgate "qui habebat"; in Weizsäcker "der die Verheissungen hatte," not "hat"; so Vaughan correctly, "The possessor of". "Him who owned the promises." *Cf.* Burton, 124 and 126. εὐλόγηκε, on the perfects of this verse and of this Epistle (viii. 5, xi. 5, etc.), Mr. J. H. Moulton asks, "Has anyone noticed the beautiful parallel in Plato, *Apol.*, 28 c., for the characteristic perfect in Hebrews, describing what *stands written* in Scripture? ὅσοι ἐν Τροίᾳ τετελευτήκασι (as is written in the Athenian's 'Bible') is exactly like Heb. vii. 6, xi. 17, 28" (*Expositor*, April, 1901, p. 280). Vaughan also says: "The γέγραπται (so to say) *quickens the dead*, and gives to the *praeterite* of the history the *permanence* of a *perfect*". Yes; but to translate by the perfect sacrifices English idiom to Greek idiom. See Burton, 82, "When the Perfect Indicative is used of a past event which is by reason of the context necessarily thought of as separated

λογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν, δεδεκάτωκε τὸν[1] Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς
ἐπαγγελίας εὐλόγηκε· 7. χωρὶς δὲ πάσης ἀντιλογίας τὸ ἔλαττον
ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος εὐλογεῖται. 8. καὶ ὧδε μὲν δεκάτας ἀποθνή-
σκοντες ἄνθρωποι λαμβάνουσιν· ἐκεῖ δὲ, μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ.
9. καὶ, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, διὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Λευὶ ὁ δεκάτας λαμβάνων
e Gen. xiv. 18. δεδεκάτωται· 10. [e]ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ τοῦ πατρὸς ἦν, ὅτε συνήν-

[1] τον inserted in ADb, etc., E**KLP, Chr., Thdrt.; omitted in ℵBCD*E*, 17, 23, 57, 109. Bleek omits because "gemäss dem Sprachgebrauche des Verfassers".

from the moment of speaking by an interval, it is impossible to render it into English adequately". The point which the writer here brings out is that, although Abraham had the promises, and was therefore himself a fountain of blessing to mankind and the person on whom all succeeding generations depended for blessing, yet Melchizedek blessed him; and as the writer adds:—

Ver. 7. **χωρὶς δὲ πάσης ἀντιλογίας . . . εὐλογεῖται.** "And without any dispute the less is blessed of the greater." Therefore, Abraham is the less, and Melchizedek the greater. The principle [expressed in its widest form by the neuter] applies where the blessing carries with it not only the verbal expression of goodwill, but goodwill achieving actual results. But man blesses God in the sense of praising Him, or desiring that all praise may be His. So God is **ὁ εὐλογητός**, Mk. xiv. 61. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 31, etc.

Ver. 8. Another note of the superiority of Melchizedek. **καὶ ὧδε μὲν δεκάτας . . .** "And here men that die receive tithes, but there one of whom it is witnessed that he liveth." **ὧδε** "here," *i.e.*, in this Levitical system with which we who are Hebrews are familiar, **ἐκεῖ**, "there" in that system identified with that ancient priest. **ἀποθνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι**, "dying men," who therefore as individuals passed away and gave place to successors, and were in this respect inferior to Melchizedek, who, so far as is recorded in Scripture, had no successor. Giving to the silence of Scripture the force of an assertion, the writer speaks of Melchizedek as **μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ**, a person of whom it is witnessed; note absence of article. So Theoph., **ὡς μὴ μνημονευομένης τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῇ γραφῇ**. Westcott distinguishes between the plural of this verse, **δεκάτας**, appropriate to the manifold tithings under the Mosaic system and the singular, **δεκάτην**, of ver. 4, one special act.

Ver. 9. **καὶ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν**, "And, I might almost say," adding a new idea with a phrase intended to indicate that it is not to be taken in strictness. It is frequent in Philo, see examples in Carpzov and add *Quis rer. div. her.*, 3. Adam's note on Plato, *Apol. Soc.*, 17A, is worth quoting "**ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν** i. q. paene dixerim: in good authors hardly ever, if at all = ut ita dicam. The phrase is regularly used to limit the extent or comprehension of a phrase or word. It is generally, but by no means exclusively, found with **οὐδείς** and **πάντες, οὐδεὶς ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν** 'hardly anyone'; **πάντες ὡς ἔ. εἰπ.** = nearly everyone." A significant use occurs in the *Republic*, p. 341B, where Socrates asks Thrasymachus whether in speaking of a "Ruler" he means **τὸν ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἢ τὸν ἀκριβεῖ λόγῳ**. The phrase is discussed at great length by Raphel. The further idea is, that "through Abraham even Levi, he who receives tithes, has paid tithes," the explanation being **ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ . . .** "for he [Levi] was yet in the loins of his father [Abraham] when Melchizedek met him," Isaac not yet having been begotten. There was a tendency in Jewish theology to view heredity in this realistic manner. Thus Schoettgen quotes Ramban on Gen. v. 2 "God calls the first human pair Adam [man] because all men were in them potentially or virtually [virtualiter]". And so some of the Rabbis argued "Eodem peccato, quo peccavit primus homo, peccavit totus mundus, quoniam hic erat totus mundus." Hence Augustine's formula "peccare in lumbis Adam," and his explanation "omnes fuimus in illo uno quando omnes fuimus ille unus" (*De Civ. Dei*, xiii. 14). On Traducianism see Loofs' *Leitfaden*, p. 194.

Vv. 11-14. The imperfection of

τησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ. 11. [f]Εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης ἦν· ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ [1] νενομοθέτητο [2]· τίς ἔτι χρεία, "κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ" ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα, καὶ οὐ "κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν" λέγεσθαι; 12. μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου μετάθεσις γίνεται. 13. ἐφ' ὃν γὰρ

[f] ver. 18, 19; Gal. ii. 21.

[1] T.R. in DcE**K, Chrys., Thdrt.; επ αυτης in ℵABCD*E*LP, 17, 31, 37, 46, 73, 118.

[2] T.R. in DcEKL; νενομοθετηται in ℵABCD*P.

the Levitical priesthood, and by implication of the whole Mosaic system, proved by the necessity of having a priest of another order.

Ver. 11. **εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις. . . .** "If then there was [or had been] perfecting by means of the Levitical priesthood—for upon it [as a basis] the people have received the law—what further need was there [or would have been] that another priest should arise after the order of Melchisedek and be styled not after the order of Aaron?" **εἰ μὲν οὖν** introduces a statement of some of the consequences resulting from the introduction of a priest of another order. It argues the failure of the Levitical priesthood to achieve **τελείωσις.** "*Perfection* is always a relative word. An institution brings perfection when it effects the purpose for which it was instituted, and produces a result that corresponds to the idea of it. The design of a priesthood is to bring men near to God (ver. 19), and this it effects by removing the obstacle in the way, *viz.* men's sin, which lying on their conscience impedes their free access to God; compare ix. 9, x. 1, 14" (Davidson). On the rendering of **ἦν** see Sonnenschein's *Greek Gram.*, 355, Obs. 3. **ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτηται,** the omitted clause is "and we are justified in demanding perfectness from the priesthood," because it is the soul of the entire legislation. All the arrangements of the law, the entire administration of the people, involves the priesthood. If there is failure in the priestly service, the whole system breaks down. It was idle to give a law without providing at the same time for the expiation of its breaches. The covenant was at the first entered into by sacrifice, and could only be maintained by a renewal of sacrifice. The priesthood stood out as the essential part of the Jewish economy. **νομοθετεῖν** to be a **νομοθέτης** used in classics sometimes with dative of person, as in LXX, Exod. xxiv. 12, **τὰς ἐντολὰς ἃς ἔγραψα νομοθετῆσαι αὐτοῖς.** Sometimes it is followed by accusative of that which is ordained by law. The use of the passive here is peculiar, *cf.* also viii. 6. The **νόμος** contained in the word, and expressed separately in ver. 12, is not the bare law contained in commandments, but the whole Mosaic dispensation. **τίς ἔτι χρεία,** this use of **ἔτι** is justified by an instance from Sextus Empiricus quoted by Wetstein: **τίς ἔτι χρεία ἀποδεικνύναι αὐτά; ἕτερον,** not **ἄλλον** but another of a different kind. **ἀνίστασθαι** so Acts vii. 18, **ἀνέστη βασιλεὺς ἕτερος** and *cf.* the transitive use in Acts ii. 24, 32, iii. 22, 26, vii. 37. **καὶ οὐ . . . λέγεσθαι.** The negative belongs rather to the description **κ. τ. τάξιν Ἀ.** than to the verb and Burton's rule (481) applies. "When a limitation of an infinitive or of its subject is to be negatived rather than the infinitive itself, the negative **οὐ** is sometimes used instead of **μή**." **λέγεσθαι** "be spoken of" or "designated".

Ver. 12. **μετατιθεμένης γὰρ. . . .** "For if the priesthood is changed, there is of necessity a change also of the law". Or, This change of priesthood being made, as it is now being made, a change of the law is also being made. The connection is: What need was there for a new priesthood? It must have been a crying need, for to change the priesthood is to change all. It means nothing short of revolution. Chrysostom rightly **τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας, τί ἔδει καινῆς διαθήκης;**

Ver. 13. This enormous change is in fact being made. **ἐφ' ὃν γὰρ λέγεται ταῦτα. . . .** "For He with reference to whom this [110th Ps. 4] is said hath partaken of another tribe from which no man hath given attendance at the altar". Here for the first time definitely in this chapter the writer introduces the fulfilment of the Psalm. It was spoken of the Messiah, and He did not belong to the tribe of Levi, but

λέγεται ταῦτα, φυλῆς ἑτέρας μετέσχηκεν, ἀφ' ἧς οὐδεὶς προσέσχηκε
g Esa. xi. 1; Matt. i. 2, etc.; Luc. iii. 33. τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· 14. [g]πρόδηλον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, εἰς ἣν φυλὴν οὐδὲν περὶ ἱερωσύνης [1] Μωσῆς ἐλάλησε.
15. Καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστιν, εἰ κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα

[1] T.R. in DcKL; περι ιερεων ουδεν in ℵ*, etc., ABC*D*EP, 17, d, e (de sacerdotibus nihil), arm.

φυλῆς ἑτέρας μετέσχηκεν, has thrown in his lot w.th, or become a member of (*cf.* ii. 14) a tribe of a different kind from the Levitical (ver. xi. 11, 12) being characterised by this, that from it **ἀφ' ἧς** issuing from which, not **ἐξ,** [as in ver. 14] no one has given attendance at the altar. [*Cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 13; Acts xx. 28; Hdt., ix. 33, **γυμνασίοισι**; Thuc., i. 15, **τοῖς ναυτικοῖς**; and the equivalent in 1 Cor. ix. 13, **οἱ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσεδρεύοντες.**] It is doubtful whether the perfect **μετέσχηκεν** can bear the meaning put upon it by Vaughan: "a striking suggestion of the identity of Christ in heaven with Christ upon earth". So too Weiss. It might seem preferable to refer it with Burton (88) to the class of perfects which in the N.T. have an aorist sense, **γέγονα, εἴληφα, ἔσχηκα.** So Weizsäcker "gehörte"; the Vulgate, however, has "de alia tribu est," and *cf.* **ἀνατέταλκεν** of ver. 14. But the perfects are best accounted for as referring to the statement of the previous verse. This great change is being made, for he of whom the 110th Psalm was spoken has actually become a member of another tribe. The result reaches to the change of priesthood.

Ver. 14. He now proceeds to name the tribe **πρόδηλον γὰρ ὅτι . . .** "For it is evident that out of Judah our Lord has sprung, concerning which tribe Moses said nothing about priests". With **πρόδηλον** may be compared **δήπου** of ii. 16. The facts of our Lord's birth were so far known that everyone connected Him with Judah. The accounts of Matthew and Luke were accepted (*cf.* Rev. v. 5). This fact of his origin would naturally militate against His claims to be Priest; but this writer here skilfully reconciles them with Scripture. Weizsäcker translates by "längst bekannt" giving to **πρό** the temporal meaning. On Clem., *ad Cor.*, xii., Lightfoot says: "It may be a question in many passages whether the preposition denotes *priority in time* or *distinctness.*" Wetstein quotes from Artemidorus **καὶ ἐφάνη πρόδηλον τὸ ὄναρ μετὰ τὴν ἀπόφασιν** and from Polyaenus **τί καὶ χρὴ γράφειν; πρόδηλον γάρ. ἀνατέταλκεν** is possibly a reminiscence of Zech. vi. 12, **Ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ Ἀνατολὴ ὄνομα αὐτῷ· καὶ ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ ἀνατελεῖ,** a passage referred to by Philo, see Carpzov in *loc.* **εἰς ἣν φυλὴν,** "**εἰς** is applied to the direction of the thought, as Acts ii. 25. **Δαυὶδ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν,** aiming at Him, E. i. 10, v. 32." Winer, 49, and so in Dion. Hal., **πολλοὶ ἐλέχθησαν εἰς τοῦτο λόγοι,** and *cf.* our own expression, "He spoke *to* such and such points". Vulg. translates "in qua tribu". Whatever Moses spoke regarding priests was spoken with reference to another tribe and not with reference to Judah.

Vv. 15-19. Imperfection of the Levitical priesthood more abundantly proved by contrast with the nature of the Melchizedek priest.

Ver. 15. **καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστιν.** "And more abundantly still is it evident" [Weizsäcker excellently "Und noch zum Ueberfluss weiter liegt die Sache klar". What is it that is more abundantly evident? Weiss says, It is, that an alteration of the priesthood has been made. Similarly Vaughan, "And this insufficiency and consequent supersession of the Levitical priesthood is still more conclusively proved by the particular designation of the predicted priest (in Ps. cx. 4) as a priest, etc.". So too Westcott. But from the twelfth verse the argument has been directed to show that there has been a change of law, and this argument is continued in ver. 15. This change of law is evident from the fact that Jesus belongs to the non-Levitical tribe of Judah, and yet more superabundantly evident from the nature of the new priest who is seen to be no longer "after the law of a carnal commandment". So Bleek after Œcumenius, Davidson, Farrar and others. **κατάδηλον,** quite evident, as in Xen., *Mem.*, i. 4, 14, **οὐ γὰρ πάνυ σοι κατάδηλον**; Wetstein quotes from Hippocrates, **ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον κατάδηλον γίνεται.** In **πρόδηλον** the preposition has the force of "ob" in "obvious"; in

Μελχισεδὲκ ἀνίσταται ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, 16. ὃς οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς[1] γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου· 17. [h] μαρτυρεῖ[2] γὰρ, "Ὅτι σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ". [h] v. 6; Ps. cx. 4.

[1] T.R. in CcorrDcEK; σαρκινης in ℵABC*D*LP.

[2] T.R. with CDcE**KL; μαρτυρειται in ℵABD*E*P.

κατάδηλον the preposition strengthens. εἰ κατὰ, κ.τ.λ. "if as is the case" or "since" (*cf.* ver. 11) "after the likeness of Melchizedek" the κατὰ τ. ταξιν of previous verses changed now into κατὰ τ. ὁμοιότητα, because attention is directed to the similarity of nature between Melchizedek and this new priest.

Ver. 16. ὃς οὐ κατὰ νόμον . . . ἀκαταλύτου, "who has become such not after the law of a fleshen ordinance but after the power of an indissoluble life". This relative clause defines the "likeness to Melchizedek," and brings out a double contrast between the new priest and the Levitical – the Levitical priesthood is κατὰ νόμον, the other κατὰ δύναμιν, the one is dependent on what is σαρκίνη, the other on what belongs to ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος. These contrasts are significant. The Levitical priesthood rested on law, on a regulation that those should be priests who were born of certain parents. This was an outward νόμος, a thing outside of the men themselves, and moreover it was a νόμος σαρκίνης ἐντολῆς, regulating the priesthood not in relation to spiritual fitness but in accordance with fleshly descent. No matter what the man's nature is nor how ill-suited and reluctant he is to the office, he becomes a priest because his fleshly pedigree is right. The new priest on the contrary did what He did, not because any official necessity was laid upon Him, but because there was a power in His own nature compelling and enabling Him, the power of a life which death did not dissolve. The contrast is between the official and the personal or real. All that is merely professional must be dispossessed by what is real. Hereditary kings gave way to Cromwell. The Marshals of France put their batons in their pockets when Joan of Arc appeared. For the difference between σάρκινος and σαρκικός see Trench, *Synonyms*, 257, who quotes the reason assigned by Erasmus for the use of the former in 2 Cor, iii. 3, "ut materiam intelligas, non qualitatem". The enactment was σαρκίνη inasmuch as it took to do only with the flesh. It caused the priesthood to be implicated with and dependent on fleshly descent. Opposed to this was the inherent energy and potentiality of an indissoluble or indestructible life. The life of the new priest is indissoluble, not as eternally existing in the Son, but as existing in Him Incarnate and fulfilling priestly functions. The term itself "indestructible" used in place of "eternal," directs the thought to the death of Jesus which might naturally seem to have threatened it with destruction. His survival of death was needful to the fulfilment of His functions as priest (see ver. 25). The meaning and reference of the term is brought out by the contrast of ver. 28 between "men who have weakness" and υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον. "Unquestionably that which enables the Son to be Messianic King and High Priest of men is His rank as Son. But it is true on the other hand that it is as Son come in the flesh that He is King and Priest. And the expression 'hath become priest' (ver. 16) points to a historical event. It is, therefore, probable that indissoluble life is attributed to Him not in general as the eternal Son, but as the Son made man."

Ver. 17. That Jesus carries on His work perennially is proved by Scripture. "For it is witnessed Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," not merely as in ver. 11, κατὰ τ. τάξιν M., although this itself involves the perpetuity of the priesthood, but expressly and emphatically εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Vv. 18 and 19 taking up the idea of ver. 16 affirm the negative and positive result of the superseding of the fleshly ordinance by the power of an indestructible life. On the one hand there is an ἀθέτησις προαγούσης ἐντολῆς, "a setting aside of a foregoing enactment," that namely which is referred to in ver. 17, and on the other hand, there is "a further bringing in of a better hope". ἐπεισαγωγὴ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, the ἐπί in ἐπεισαγωγή balances προαγούσης, and indicates that the better hope was introduced over and above all that had already been done in the same

i Gal. iv. 9.
k iv. 16; Joan. i. 17; Acts xiii. 39; Rom. iii. 21, 28, et viii. 3; Eph. ii. 18, et iii. 12; Gal. ii. 16.
l Ps. cx. 4.

18. [i]Ἀθέτησις μὲν γὰρ γίνεται προαγούσης ἐντολῆς, διὰ τὸ [h]αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές· 19. [k]οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος· ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ. 20. Καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας· [l]οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, 21. ὁ δὲ μετὰ ὁρκωμοσίας, διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος

behalf of bringing men to God. The **μὲν . . . δὲ** indicate that the sentence must thus be construed, and not as rendered in A.V. The reason of this replacement of the old legal enactment is given in the clause, **διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές** "on account of its weakness and uselessness". This arrangement depending on the flesh was helpless to achieve the most spiritual of achievements, the union of man with God, the bringing together in true spiritual fellowship of sinful and earthly man with the holy God. So Paul found that arrangements of a mechanical and external nature were **ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα,** Gal. iv. 9. "The *uselessness* (unhelplessness) of the priesthood was proved by its inability to aid men in that **ἐγγίζειν τῷ Θεῷ,** which is their one want" (Vaughan). The ordinance regulating the priesthood failed to accomplish its object; and indeed this characterised the entire system of which it was a characteristic part. **οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος,** "for nothing was brought to perfection by the law". The law made beginnings, taught rudiments, gave initial impulses, hinted, foreshadowed, but brought nothing to perfection, did not in itself provide for man's perfect entrance into God's fellowship. Therefore there was introduced that which did achieve in perfect form this reconcilement with God, *viz.:* a better hope, which is therefore defined as **δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ,** "by which we draw near to God". The law said (Exod. xix. 21) **διαμάρτυραι τῷ λαῷ μήποτε ἐγγίσωσι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.** The "better" hope is that which springs from belief in the indestructible life of Christ and the assurance that that life is still active in the priestly function of intercession. It is the hope that is anchored within the veil fixed in Christ's person and therefore bringing us into God's presence and fellowship.

Vv. 20-22. Another element in the superiority of the covenant established upon the priesthood of Jesus is that in the very manner of the institution of His priesthood it was declared to be permanent. The long parenthesis of ver. 21 being held aside the statement of 20-22 reads thus: "And [in roducing a fresh consideration] in proportion as not without an oath [was He made priest] . . . in that proportion better is the covenant of which Jesus has become the surety". The parenthesis of ver. 21 is inserted to confirm by an appeal to Scripture [Ps. cx. 4] the fact that by the swearing of an oath the Melchizedek priest was appointed, and to indicate the significance of this mode of appointment, *viz.:* that repentance or change of plan is excluded. That is to say, this priesthood is final, eternal. And the superiority of the priesthood involves the superiority of the covenant based upon it. The oath signifies therefore the transition from a provisional and temporary covenant to that which is eternal. **καθ' ὅσον.** This form of argument is frequent in Philo, see *Quis. Rev. Div. H.*, 17, etc. **οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας,** "not without oath-swearing"; the clause may be completed from that which follows, "has he been made priest," as in A.V., although Weiss maintains that this is "sprachwidrig" and that the broken clause "kann natürlich nur aus dem Vorigen ergänzt werden". But it is most natural and grammatical to complete it from the sentence in which it stands: "As not without an oath, so of a better covenant *has Jesus become surety*". The parenthesis thus furnishes the needed ground of this statement. He became surety by becoming priest, and as priest he was constituted with an oath. **οἱ μὲν γὰρ** "For the one [that is, the Levitical priests] **εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες** "have been made priests" Vaughan renders "are having become priests—are priests having become so". So Delitzsch, Weiss and von Soden. Westcott says: "The periphrasis marks the possession as well as the impartment of the office;" and on the "periphrastic conjugation" see Blass, sec. 62; Stephanus Thesaurus *s.v.* **εἰμί,** and *cf.* Acts

πρὸς αὐτὸν, "Ὤμοσε Κύριος καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται, Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ[1]". 22. [m] κατὰ τοσοῦτον[2] m viii. 6.

[1] T.R. in ℵ[c]ADEKLP, d, e, Copt., Syr[utr], Aeth.; om. κατα τ. ταξιν Μελχ. with ℵ*BC, 17, 80, f, vg., Sah., Basm., Arm.

[2] T.R. ℵ[c]D[3]EKL; τοσουτο with ℵ*ABC, 17, 23, 39, 115. Both forms found in Attic though τοσουτον is more frequent. See Blass, *Gram.*, p. 36.

xxi. 29, ἦσαν γὰρ προεωρακότες.]. ὁ δὲ μετὰ ὅρκ. "but the other [the new priest] with an oath," μετὰ of course not being instrumental, but "interposito jurejurando"; where and how this oath is to be found is next explained, it is διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος . . . "through Him that saith to him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art," etc. There is no call to translate πρὸς αὐτόν "in reference to Him"; neither is there any difficulty in referring the words ὤμοσε . . . μεταμελ. to God. "Though the words are not directly spoken by the Lord, they are His by implication. The oath is His" (Westcott). On the distinction between μετανοέω and μεταμέλομαι see Trench, *Synonyms*, 241. "He who has *changed his mind* about the past is in the way to change everything; he who has an *after care* may have little or nothing more than a selfish dread of the consequences of what he has done." This, however, does not apply to the LXX (from which the quotation of this verse is taken) where both words are used to translate נָחַם. *Cf.* 1 Kings xv. 29 and 35. κατὰ τοσοῦτο "by so much," that is, the superiority of the new covenant to the old is in the ratio of eternity to time, of what is permanent and adequate to what is transitory and provisional. κρείττονος διαθήκης "of a better covenant" ["id est, non infirmae et inutilis. Frequens in hac epistola epitheton, κρείττων, item αἰώνιος, ἀληθινὸς, δεύτερος, διαφορώτερος, ἕτερος, ζῶν, καινὸς, μέλλων, νέος, πρόσφατος, τέλειος" (Bengel)], here first mentioned in the Epistle, but whose character and contents and relation to the "foregoing" covenant are fully explained in the following chapter. Here already its "betterness" is recognisable in this, that it supersedes the older, and is itself permanent because perfectly accomplishing the purposes of a covenant.

Ver. 22. διαθήκη in classical Greek means a *disposition* (διατίθημι) of one's goods by will; frequent in the orators and sometimes as in Aristoph., *Birds*, 439, a covenant. In the LXX it occurs nearly 280 times and in all but four passages it is the translation of בְּרִית "covenant". (See Hatch. *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, 47.) It is used indifferently of agreements between men and of contracts or engagements between God and man. See Introduction and on ix. 16 and Thayer *s.v.* Of this "better covenant" Jesus "has become and is" [γέγονεν] ἔγγυος "surety". ἔγγυος is explained in the Greek commentators by ἐγγυητής, which is the commoner of the two forms, at least in later Greek. ἔγγυος occurs several times in the fragments from the second century B.C. given in Grenfell and Hunt's *Greek Papyri*, series ii.; also in the fragments from first century A.D. given in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. It is not the exact equivalent of μεσίτης (found in a similar connection viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24) which is a more comprehensive term. It has been questioned why in this place ἔγγυος is used, and Peirce answers: "I am apt to think he was led to this by his having just before used the word ἐγγίζομεν, and that he did it for the sake of the paronomasia". And Bruce says: "There is literary felicity in the use of the word as playfully alluding to the foregoing word ἐγγίζομεν. There is more than literary felicity, for the two words probably have the same root, so that we might render ἔγγυος., *the one who insures permanently near relations with God.*" More likely he chose the word because his purpose was not to exhibit Jesus as negotiating the covenant, but especially as securing that it should achieve its end. It has been debated whether it is meant that Jesus was surety for men to God, as was held by both Lutheran and Reformed writers, or with others (Grotius, Peirce, etc.), that He was surety for God to men ["His being a surety relates to His acting in the behalf of God towards us and to His assuring us of the divine favour, and to His bestowing the benefits promised by God" (Peirce)] or, with Limborch, Baumgarten and Schmid (see Bleek) that he was surety for both

κρείττονος[1] διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς. 23. Καὶ οἱ μὲν,
n ix. 24; · om. viii. πλείονές εἰσι γεγονότες ἱερεῖς,[2] διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παρα-
34; 1 Tim. ii. 5; μένειν· 24. ὁ δὲ, διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀπαράβατον
1 Joan ii. 2. ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην· 25. [n]ὅθεν καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται

[1] T.R. in ℵcACcDEKLP; και κρειττονος in ℵ*BC*.

[2] γεγονοτες ante ιερεις with ℵBLP; post ιερεις in ACDE, 17, d, e.

parties. There is no reason to suppose that the writer particularised in any of these directions. He merely wished to express the thought that by the appointment of Jesus to the priestoood, the covenant based upon this priesthood was secured against all failure of any of the ends for which it was established.

Vv. 23-25. Another ground of the perfectness of the new priesthood is found in the continued life of the priest, who ever lives to make intercession and can therefore save completely, whereas the Levitical priests were compelled by death to give place to others.

Ver. 23. **καὶ**, as above, ver. 20, introducing a new element in the argument. **οἱ μὲν**, as in ver. 21, the Levitical priests, **πλείονες . . .** "have been made priests many in number," not many at one and the same time [Delitzsch], although that also is true, but many in succession, as is shown by the reason assigned **διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν** "because of their being prevented by death from abiding" "in their office," Peirce, as Œcumenius, **ἐν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ δηλονότι.** Others think that remaining in life is meant. Possibly **πλείονες** is used instead of **πολλοί**, because there is a latent comparison with the one continuing priest, or with those already priests; always more and more. He, on the contrary, **ὁ δὲ**, by reason of his abiding for ever **ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην** "has his priesthood inviolable," that is, no other person can step into it. The form of expression is similar to that used by Epiphanius of the Trinity, **ἡ δὲ ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν φύσιν.** The meaning of **ἀπαράβ.** is contested, some interpreters (Weiss, etc.) supposing that it signifies "indefeasible," or "untransmitted" or "nontransferable". Indeed, Œcumenius and Theophylact translate it by **ἀδιάδοχον.** But in every instance of its occurrence given by Stephanus and Wetstein it has a passive sense, as **νόμος, ὅρκος**, etc., **ἀπαράβ.**, and means unalterable or inviolable. This suits the present passage perfectly, and returns upon the thought of ver. 3, that the new priest is sole and perpetual occupant of the office, giving place to no successor. **ὅθεν**, "whence," *i.e.*, because of His having this absolute priesthood; His saving power depends upon His priesthood. He is able **καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελές**, "even to save to the uttermost," not to be referred merely to time as in Vulgate "in perpetuum," and Chrysostom, **οὐ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν μόνον φησὶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ ζωῇ.** If referred to time, it might mean either ability to save the individual eternally, or to save future generations. Peirce joins it with **δύναται**, and renders "whence also he is perpetually able to save". But the phrase uniformly means "completely," "thoroughly," as in Luke xiii. 11 of the woman, **μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ παντελές** and in the examples cited by Wetstein. This, as Riehm shows (p. 613, note), *includes* the idea of perpetuity. The Levitical priests could not so save: no **τελείωσις** was achieved by them; but everything for which the priesthood existed, everything which is comprised in the great [ii. 3] and eternal [v. 9] salvation, the deliverance [ii. 15] and glory [ii. 10] which belong to it, are achieved by Christ. The objects of this saving power are **τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ**, "those who through Him approach God"; "through Him" no longer relying on the mediation of Levitical priests, but recognising Jesus as the "new and living way," x. 19-22. This complete salvation Jesus can accomplish because **πάντοτε ζῶν . . . αὐτῶν**, "ever living to intercede on their behalf". The particular mode in which His eternal priesthood applies itself to those who through Him approach God is that He intercedes for them, thus effecting their real introduction to God's presence and their acceptance by Him, and also the supply of all their need out of the Divine fulness. **ἐντυγχάνειν**, "to meet by chance," "to light upon," takes as its second meaning, "to converse

τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ, πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγ- o iv. 14, 15, et ix. 24; Rom. viii. 34; 1 Joan ii. 2.
χάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. 26. °τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν[1] ἀρχιερεύς,
ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, καὶ

[1] T.R. in ℵCKLP it vg.; insert και before επρεπεν ABDE, Syr^{utr}.

with" (followed by dative), hence "to entreat one to do something" (Plut., *Pomp.*, 55; *Ages.*, 25), and when followed by περί (Polyb., iv. 76, 9) or by ὑπέρ (Plut., *Cato Maj.*, 9) "to intercede". (See Liddell and Scott.) It is not the word itself, but the preposition following, that gives the idea of *intercession*. The word with a different preposition can be used in the sense of appealing *against*, as in Rom. xi. 2, ὡς ἐντυγ. τ. Θεῷ κατὰ τ. Ἰσραήλ, see also 1 Mac. xi. 25. With ὑπέρ it occurs in Rom. viii. 27, 34, and with περί in Acts xxv. 24. Christ, then, treats with God in our behalf; and He lives for this. As His life on earth was spent in the interests of men, so He continues to spend Himself in this same cause. He ever lives, and being "the same yesterday, to-day and for ever" (xiii. 8) His present fulness of life is devoted to those ends which evoked His energies while on earth. He secures that the fulness of Divine resource shall be available for men. "All things are ours." This intercession is not the same as the Atoning sacrifice and its presentation before God, which was accomplished once for all (ix. 26, x. 18); but it is based upon the sacrifice which is also to men the guarantee that His intercession is real, and comprehensive of all their needs. [*Cf.* Sir Walter Raleigh's *Pilgrimage*.]

Vv. 26-28. A summary description of the Melchizedek ideal priest, drawn in contrast to the Levitical High Priest, and realised in the Son who has been perfected as Priest for ever. Melchizedek is here dropped, and the priesthood of the Son is now directly contrasted with that of the Aaronic High Priest.

Ver. 26. Τοιοῦτος γὰρ . . . ἀρχιερεύς. "*Such* seems to refer to the Melchizedek character delineated in the preceding part of the chapter, or to all that was said of the nature and character of the Son from iv. 14 onward. The sense will not differ if it be supposed to refer to the epithets and statements that follow, for these but summarise what went before" (Davidson and others). But it must not be overlooked that ὅς (ver. 27) is one of the usual relatives after τοιοῦτος (*cf.* viii. 1, and Soph., *Antig.*, 691, λόγοις τοιούτοις οἷς; *cf.* also Longinus, *De Sublim.*, ix. 2. So that Farrar's statement on chap. viii. 1, "τοιόσδε is prospective, τοιοῦτος is retrospective," is incorrect), and that the adjectives ὅσιος, κ.τ.λ. prepare for and give the ground of the statement made in the relative clause. The sentence therefore reads: "So great a high priest as need not daily, etc., . . . became us," ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν, not, as in viii. 1, τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα (*cf.* iv. 14, 15), because the writer wishes to draw attention to the needs of those for whom the priest was appointed [ἡμῖν emphatic] and his suitableness to those needs. We, being what we are, sinful and dependent on the mediation of others, need a priest in whom we can wholly trust, because He Himself is holy, separate from sinners, without human weakness. Westcott's distribution of the terms is neat, although of doubtful validity. "Christ is personally in Himself *holy*, in relation to men *guileless*, in spite of contact with a sinful world, *undefiled*. By the issue of His life He has been *separated from sinners* in regard to the visible order, and, in regard to the invisible world, He has *risen above the heavens*". ὅσιος frequently in the Psalms, where it translates חָסִיד] denotes personal holiness, while ἅγιος and ἱερός express the idea of consecration. [See Trench, *Synon.*] Weiss, however, says: "ὅσιος, ein Synonym von ἅγιος" (Vulg., Ps. iv. 4, xvi. 10) "bezeichnet die religiöse Weihe des Gottangehörigen" (Tit. i. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 8). Peirce understands that here the word means "merciful". But this is scarcely consistent with N.T. usage. ἄκακος, "innocent," and frequently with the idea of inexperience which attaches to the English word [*cf.* the definition which Trench, *Synon.*, p. 197, quotes from Basil; and see also the use of ἀκακία in Ps. xxxvi. 37, and of ἄκακοι in Ps. xxiv. 21. Its use in Jer. xi. 19 is significant, ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς ἀρνίον ἄκακον ἀγόμενον τοῦ θύεσθαι.] Here the word seems to point to that entire absence of evil thought and slightest taint of malice

p v. 3, et ix. 12, 28, et x. 12; Lev. ix. 7, et xvi. 6, 11.
q ii. 10, et v. 1, 2, 9.

ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος· 27. [p] ὃς οὐκ ἔχει καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίας ἀναφέρειν, ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ, ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας.[1] 28. [q] ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς, ἔχοντας ἀσθένειαν· ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ὁρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον, υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον.

[1] T.R. with BDEKLP; προσενεγκας in ℵA, 17, 73, 80, Cyrnest 93.

which might prompt disregard of human need. **ὅσιος** denotes His oneness with God, **ἄκακος** His oneness with His fellow-men. He is not separated from them, or rendered indifferent by any selfishness. Neither has His contact with the world left any soil; He is **ἀμίαντος**, "stainless," and so fit to appear before God. *Cf.* the stringent laws regarding uncleanness and blemish laid down for the Levitical priests in Lev. xxi. 1, xxii. 9. And as the high priest in Israel was not permitted to go out of the sanctuary nor come near a dead body, though of his father or mother (Lev. xxi. 11, 12), and as the later law enjoined a seven-days' separation of the high priest before the day of Atonement (Schoettgen in *loc.*), so our Lord fulfilled this symbolic isolation by being in heart and life **κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν**. If there is anything in the symbol, then this separation occurred before the sacrifice was made, and as a preparation for it, but almost all modern interpreters (Grotius, Bengel, "separatus est, relicto mundo," Peirce, Tholuck, Bleek, Alford, Davidson, Rendall, von Soden, but not Milligan) refer the separation to His exaltation. "In virtue of His exaltation He is now for evermore withdrawn from all perturbing contact with evil men" (Delitzsch). Being co-ordinate with the previous adjectives, while the **ὑψηλότερος γεν.** is added by **καὶ**, it would seem that **κεχωρ.** refers to the result achieved by His earthly life with all its temptations. By the seclusion of the high priest it was hinted that before entering God's presence the priest must be isolated from the contamination of human intercourse: there must be a period of quarantine; but our High Priest has carried through all the confusion and turmoil and defilement and exasperation of life an absolute immunity from contagion or stain. He was with God throughout, and throughout was separated by an atmosphere of His own from sinners. **καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος**, "and made higher than the heavens," which apparently has a meaning similar to iv. 14, "We have a great High Priest who has passed through the heavens," *cf.* also Eph. iv. 10. It is not "and has been set," but **γενόμενος**, has by His own career and character attained that dignity. It is by right, as the necessary result of His life, that He is above the heavens. "He is now become, strictly speaking, as to His mode of being, supra-mundane" (Delitzsch). [For the word, *cf.* Lucian, *Nigr.*, 25, **ἑαυτὸν ὑψηλότερον λημμάτων παρέχειν**, to show himself superior to gains.] **ὃς οὐκ ἔχει καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην . . .** "who does not need daily, like the high priests, to offer sacrifices first for His own sins, then for the people's; for this He did once for all by offering Himself". As shown by the relative, this is the main affirmation to which the preceding clauses lead up. The one offering of Christ is contrasted with the continually repeated offerings of the Levitical high priests; and His Sonship priesthood to which He was instituted by an oath is set over against the service of men who had first to be cleansed from their own defilements before they could sacrifice for the sins of the people. In the words **καθ' ἡμέραν**, when **κατ' ἐνιαυτόν** (x. 1) might have been expected, a difficulty has been found. It was on the Day of Atonement, once a year, that the high priest offered first for himself and then for the people, see ix 7. Accordingly, several interpreters, such as Bleek, Lünemann, Davidson adopt the idea that the writer blends in one view the ordinary daily sacrifice and the sacrifice of the day of Atonement. Others again, as Hofmann, Delitzsch, Alford, maintain that the position of **καθ' ἡμέραν** shows that it belongs only to **ὃς** [Christ], not to **οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς**, so that the sentence really means: "Who has not need day by day, as the high priests had year by

year". Weiss renders this interpretation more probable by pointing out that the words have a reference to **πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν** of ver. 25. His intercession is continuous, from day to day, but in order to accomplish it He does not need day by day to purify Himself and renew His sacrifice. *Cf.* also the seven days' purification of the high priest on entering his office, Exod. xxix. 13-8. **θυσίας ἀναφέρειν**, a phrase resulting from the *carrying up* of the sacrifice to the raised altar, and only found in Hellenistic, frequently in LXX. The more usual word in this Epistle (twenty times and frequently in LXX) is **προσφέρειν**. "**ἀναφέρειν** properly describes the ministerial action of the priest, and **προσφέρειν** the action of the offerer (Lev. ii. 14, 16, vi. 33, 35), but the distinction is not observed universally; thus **ἀναφέρειν** is used of the people (Lev. xvii. 5), and **προσφέρειν** of the priests (Lev. xxi. 21)" (Westcott). **πρότερον . . . ἔπειτα**, as in v. 3, "they must first offer for themselves, because they may not approach God sin-stained; they must also offer for the people, because they may not introduce a sin-stained people to God" (Weiss). **τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν . . .** This, *i.e.*, offering for the sins of the people. But it must be borne in mind that this writer keeps in view that Christ also had a preparation for His priestly ministry in the sinless temptations and sufferings He endured, vv. 7-10. The emphasis is on **ἐφάπαξ**, in contrast to the **καθ' ἡμέραν**, and the ground of the **ἐφάπαξ** is given in **ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας**, an offering which by the nature of the case could not be repeated, ix. 27, 28, and which by its worth rendered repetition superfluous. This difference between the new priest and the old is based upon their essential difference of nature, "For the law appoints as high priests men who have weakness," which especially gives the reason, as in v. 3, why they must sacrifice for themselves. In v. 3 the weakness is ascribed to the same source as here; the high priest is **ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος**. In c. 5, however, the fact that the high priest is taken from among men is introduced chiefly for the sake of illustrating his sympathy: here it is introduced in contrast to **υἱόν** of the next clause, which is thus raised to a higher than human dignity. For had this contrast not been intended, **τούς** would have been used, and not **ἀνθρώπους**. The law only made provision for the appointment of priests who had human weakness: the word of the oath (already explained in vv. 20-22), **τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον**, "which [oath-swearing] came after the law," and therefore showed that the law needed revisal and supplementing ["Debent posteriora in legibus esse perfectiora" (Grotius)]. It might have been argued that the Law coming after Melchizedek introduced an improved priesthood. It is therefore worth while to point out that the adoption of the Melchizedek priesthood as the type of the Messianic was subsequent to the Law, and consequently superseded it. **υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον** [appoints], "a son who has been made perfect for ever". **υἱὸν**, without the article, because attention is called to the nature of the new priest, as in i. 1. "Son," in the fullest sense, as described in i. 1-4, and in contrast to **ἀνθρώπους**. He also, though a Son, became man, and was exposed to human temptations, but by this experience was "perfected" as our Priest. *Cf.* vv. 7-10. "For ever perfected" is directly contrasted with the sinful yielding to infirmity exhibited by the Levitical priests, and must therefore be referred to moral perfecting, as explained in chap. v. This perfectness of the Son is confirmed and sealed by His exaltation; He is for ever perfected in the sense, as Grotius says, "ut nec morti nec ullis adversis subjaceat". *Cf.* ix. 27, 28. The A.V. translates "consecrated," which Davidson denounces, with Alford, as "altogether false". But this translation at any rate suggests that it is perfectness as our priest the writer has in view; and the use of **τελειόω** in Lev. xxi. 10 and other passages cannot be thus lightly set aside.

CHAPTER VIII.—Vv. 1-6. The idea of Christ's priesthood, merely suggested in i. 3, expressly affirmed in ii. 17, has been from iv. 14 onwards enlarged upon and illustrated. It has been shown that Christ is a priest, called by God to this office and proclaimed by God as High Priest. The superiority of His orders as belonging not to the hereditary Aaronic line, but as being "after the order of Melchisedek," has also been exhibited. Passing now from the person and qualifications of the Priest, the author proceeds in chap. viii. to illustrate his greatness from a consideration of the *place* of His ministry. It is in heaven He is seated, a minister of the real tabernacle, not of that which had been pitched by Moses as an image and

a i. 3, 13, et iii. 1, et iv. 14, et vi. 20, et ix. 11, et xii. 2; Eph.i.20; Col. iii. 1.

VIII. 1. [a]ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΟΝ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς

symbol of it. The priesthood to which God called Him *must* be a heavenly ministry, for were He on earth He would not even be a priest, not to say a High Priest. His ministry, therefore, being in the heaven of eternal realities, is a "better ministry," in accordance with the fact that he is mediating a "better covenant".

Ver. 1. **κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις**, not, as A.V., "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum" (*cf.* Grotius "post tot dicta haec esto summa"), but with Field "Now to crown our present discourse" or with Rendall "Now to crown what we are saying". **κεφάλαιον** is used to denote either *the sum*, as of numbers added up from below to the *head* of the column where the result is set down, and in this sense it is here understood by Erasmus, Calvin and A.V.; or, *the chief point* as of a cope-stone or capital of a pillar, as in Thucyd., vi. 6. **λέγοντες ἄλλα τε πολλὰ καὶ κεφάλαιον, οἱ Συρακόσιοι, κ.τ.λ.** Other examples in Field's O.N., to which add Plutarch, *De Educ. Puer.*, 8, **ἓν πρῶτον καὶ μέσον καὶ τελευταῖον ἐν τούτοις κεφάλαιον ἀγωγὴ σπουδαία.** This latter sense alone satisfies the present passage, and also agrees better with **ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις** for **ἐπὶ** must here be taken in a quasi-local sense, as Vaughan paraphrases "as a capital upon the things which are being said—as a thought (or fact) forming the headstone of the argument—we add this". *Cf.* Luke xvi. 26 **καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις.** That **λεγομένοις** is in the present is manifestly no objection to this rendering. The absence of the article before **κεφάλ.** does not involve, as Lünemann supposes, that the writer means "*a* main point" among others, for such words do not in similar situations require the article, *cf.* Demosth., p. 924, **τεκμήριον δὲ τούτου. κεφάλαιον** is most easily construed as a nominative absolute (*cf.* Buttmann, p. 381) not, as Bruce, "an accusative in apposition with the following sentence". **τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα . . .** "so great a High Priest have we as took His seat (or, is set down) on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens". **τοιοῦτον**, not, as Farrar and Rendall, "retrospective," although as contrasted with **τοιόσδε** this is its proper meaning; but here, as frequently in classics [Soph., *Antig.*, 691, **λόγοις τοιούτοις οἷς σὺ μὴ τέρψει κλύων,** and Demosth., p. 743, followed also by **ὥστε**] it finds its explanation in **ὃς ἐκάθισεν** [**τοιοῦτον** weist natürlich nicht rückwärts sondern vorwärts auf den dasselbe erläuternden Relativsatz. Weiss.] The greatness of the High Priest is manifested by the place where He ministers. His greatness is revealed in his sitting down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. Westcott thinks that the thought of a High Priest who . . . "is King as well as priest is clearly the prominent thought of the sentence". And Moulton on x. 12 says: "The words 'sat down' (Ps. cx. 1), add to the priestly imagery that of kingly state". But undoubtedly Weiss is right in saying "Durch den Relativsatz soll nicht auf die königliche Herrlichkeit Christi hingewiesen werden". The writer means to magnify Christ's priesthood by reminding his readers that it is exercised "in the heavens"; as he says in ix. 24 he has passed **εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν** into heaven itself, the very presence of God and eternal reality, the ultimate, highest possible. On the words *cf.* note on i. 3. **ἐκάθισεν** is considered by Buttmann to be one of those aorists which stand for the perfect (see his instructive remarks on the aversion to the perfect, *Gram.*, p. 198); but this may be doubted, as the sitting is not mentioned as the permanent attitude, but merely as suggesting the exaltation of the High Priest, and the finality of His purification of sins, as in i. 3. Augustine, *De Fide et symbolo*, 7, warns against the suggested anthropomorphism of the words "sitteth at the right hand" and says "*ad dextram* intelligendum est dictum esse, in summa beatitudine, ubi justitia et pax et gaudium est". Here, however, it is rather Christ's *majesty* that is suggested, and as Pearson on this clause of the Creed says, "The belief of Christ's glorious session is most necessary in respect of the immediate consequence which is his most gracious intercession," rather his *availing* intercession. *Cf.* Hooker, Book V., chap. 55.

οὐρανοῖς, 2. [b]τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος, καὶ [1] οὐκ ἄνθρωπος. 3. [c]πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας καθίσταται· ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὃ προσενέγκῃ. 4. εἰ μὲν γὰρ [2] ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδ' ἂν ἦν ἱερεὺς, ὄντων τῶν ἱερέων [3] τῶν προσφερόντων κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὰ δῶρα,

[b] ix. 8, 11, 24, et x. 21.
[c] v. 1; Eph. v. 2.

[1] ADᶜE**KLP, f, vg., Copt., insert και; ℵBD*E* 17, d, e, omit και.
[2] T.R. in DᶜEKL Syrp, Arm.; ουν in ℵABD*P, 17, 73, 80, 137, d, e, f, vg.
[3] T.R. in DᶜE**KL Syrutr, Chrys.; ℵABD*E*P, 17, 73, 137, d, e, f, vg. omit των ιερεων.

Ver. 2. **τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς . . .** "a minister of the [true] holy place and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man". **τῶν ἁγίων** not = **τῶν ἡγιασμένων** as Œcumenius translates, but as in ix. 8, 12, 25; x. 19; xiii. 11 = **ἅγια ἁγίων** of ix. 3. In ix. 2, 3, the outer part of the tabernacle is called **ἅγια**, the inner **ἅγια ἁγίων**, but ver. 8 is conclusive proof that **ἅγια** without addition was used for the holiest place. **λειτουργὸς** *cf.* note on i. 14. **καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς**, the ideal, antitypal tabernacle; **ἀληθ.** used as in the fourth gospel in contrast not to what is false, but to what is symbolical. It is to be taken with **ἁγίων** as well as with **σκηνῆς**. *Cf.* Bleek; and see ix. 11, **τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου**, which is the equivalent of the clause added here, **ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος**. See also Mark xiv. 58 and the striking words of Wisdom ix. 8. In a different sense in Numb. xxiv. 6, **ὡσεὶ σκηναὶ ἃς ἔπηξε Κύριος**. According to the fifth verse, man pitched a tabernacle which was a shadow of the true, and the very words in which was uttered the command so to do, might have reminded the people that there was a symbolic and a true tabernacle.

Ver. 3. **πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς. . . .** "For every High Priest is appointed for the offering of gifts and sacrifices, and therefore it was necessary that this man also have something to offer". That Christ is in heaven as a **λειτουργός**, as an active minister in holy things, is proved by the universal law, that every High Priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices. Christ is not idle in heaven, but being there as High Priest He must be offering something; what that is, He has told us in vii. 27, but here no emphasis is on the *what*, but merely on the fact that He must be offering something, must be actively ministering in heaven as a **λειτουργός**. [Bruce therefore overlooks vii. 27 in his interpretation: "He is content for the present to throw out the remark: 'This man must have something to offer,' and to leave his readers for a while to puzzle over the question, What is it?"] With **ἀναγκαῖον** some have understood **ἦν** rather than **ἐστὶ** "necesse fuit habere quod offerret" (Beza) followed by Westcott, etc., on the ground that the reference is to our Lord's presentation to the Father of His finished sacrifice. But it is better to give the word a merely logical and subjective force; it is a necessary inference that this man, etc. Behind and beyond this lies no doubt the reference to Christ's sacrifice. As the High Priest could not enter into the Holiest without the blood of the victim (ix. vii.), so must Jesus accomplish His priestly office by offering His own blood (ix. 12). For the words of the former part of the verse see note on vi. 1.

Ver. 4. **εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ γῆς . . .** "And indeed if He were on earth He would not even be a priest, since there are those who according to law offer the gifts". **μὲν οὖν** = et quidem (Devarius, p. 125) or, it might be rendered "If however," see Hermann's *Viger*, p. 442. Vaughan says: "The **οὖν** is (as usual) *in accordance with the above statement*; here, namely, that *He must have something to offer*". The apodosis in ver. 6. **νυνὶ δὲ.** The argument is, given or assumed as already proved that Christ is our High Priest, it must be in Heaven He exercises His ministry, for if He were on earth, He would not even be a priest, not to say, a High Priest. [As Bleek has it, 'er würde nicht einmal Priester sein,—geschweige denn Hohe priester".] He could not be a priest, because the priestly office on earth is already filled. The law [**κατὰ νόμον**], which can not be interfered with, regulates all that concerns the earthly priesthood (vii. 12), and by this law He is excluded from priestly office, not being of the tribe of Levi (vii. 14). **τὰ δῶρα** "the gifts" further

d x. 1; Exod. xxv. 40; Acts vii. 44; Col. ii. 17.

5. [d] οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσι τῶν ἐπουρανίων, καθὼς κεχρημάτισται Μωσῆς μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνήν, "Ὅρα," γάρ φησι, "ποιήσῃς[1] πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ

[1] T.R. in minuscules; ποιησεις in ℵABDEKLP.

emphasises the rigorous prescriptions of the law. The absence of the article before **νόμον** does not necessitate though it suggests the translation "according to law".

Ver. 5. **οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι . . .** "priests who serve a suggestion and shadow of the heavenly things, even as Moses when about to make the tabernacle was admonished, for 'See,' He says, 'that thou make all things after the pattern shown thee in the Mount'", **οἵτινες** with its usual classifying and characterising reference, priests distinguished by the fact that they serve a shadow. **λατρεύουσιν,** originally to work for hire, from **λάτρις,** *a hired servant* (Soph., *Trach.*, 70, etc.), but used especially in classics, LXX, and N.T. of service of God. It is followed by the dative of the person served (see reff.) Heb. ix. 14, xii. 28, and xiii. 10 as here **οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες. ὑποδείγματι,** Phrynichus notes, **ὑπόδειγμα· οὐδὲ τοῦτο ὀρθῶς λέγεται· παράδειγμα λέγε.** To which Rutherford adds, "In Attic **ὑποδείκνυμι** was never used except in its natural sense of *show by implication;* but in Herodotus and Xenophon it signifies *to mark out, set a pattern*". The meaning of **ὑπόδειγμα** accordingly is "a sign suggestive of anything," "a delineation," "outline," perhaps "suggestion" would satisfy the present passage. **σκιᾷ,** "an adumbration of a reality which it does not embody" (Vaughan). A shadow has no substance in itself, no independent existence. It merely gives assurance that there is a reality to cast it, but itself is nothing solid or real. So the tabernacle gave assurance of the existence of a real dwelling of God which itself was not. *Cf.* x. 1, and Col. ii. 17. **τῶν ἐπουρανίων,** as in ix. 23 **τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς . . . αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια,** heavenly things, in a comprehensive sense. **καθὼς κεχρημάτισται . . . καθὼς,** *i.e.* the description of the Mosaic tabernacle as a shadow of the heavenly accords with the directions given to Moses in its erection. **κεχρημάτισται,** **χρηματίζω** (from **χρῆμα**) originally means "to transact business," "to advise" or "give answer to those asking advice"; hence "to give a response to those who consult an oracle"; then, dropping all reference to a foregoing consultation, it means "to give a divine command" and in passive to be commanded; see Thayer. The perfect tense is explained by Delitzsch thus: "as thou Moses hast received (in our Scriptures) the divine injunction (which we still read there)". But *cf.* Burton, *M. and T.*, 82. **ἐπιτελεῖν,** not, to complete what was already begun; but to realise what was determined by God; *cf.* Num. xxiii. 23, and Heb. ix. 6; so that it might be rendered "to bring into being". **Ὅρα γάρ φησιν . . .** He now cites the authoritative injunction referred to and which determines that the earthly tabernacle was but a copy of the heavenly. **γάρ** of course belongs to the writer, not to the quotation, and **φησιν** has for its nominative the **Θεός** implied in **κεχρημάτισται. ποιήσεις. . . .** The words are quoted from Exod. xxv. 40 (adding **πάντα** and substituting **δειχθέντα** for **δεδειγμένον**) and are a literal rendering of the Hebrew, so that nothing can be gathered from them regarding N.T. usage. The future indicative being regularly used as a legal imperative (an unclassic usage) it naturally occurs here. **κατὰ τὸν τύπον,** a stamp or impression (**τύπτειν**) struck from a die or seal; hence, a figure, draft, sketch, or pattern. How or in what form this was communicated to the mind of Moses we do not know. "In the Mount," *i.e.*, in Sinai where Moses retired for communion with God, he probably pondered the needs of the people to such good purpose that from suggestions received in Egypt, together with his own divinely guided conceptions, he was able to contrive the tabernacle and its ordinances of worship. It is his spiritual insight and his anticipation of his people's wants which give him his unique place in history. And it is both to trifle and to detract from his greatness to say with some of the Rabbis (*vide* Schoettgen) that models of the Ark and the candlestick and the other equipment descended from heaven, and that Gabriel in a workman's apron showed him how to reproduce the articles shown.

ὄρει". 6. [e]νυνὶ δὲ διαφορωτέρας τέτευχε[1] λειτουργίας, ὅσῳ καὶ e vii. 22; 2 Cor. iii. 6.
κρείττονός ἐστι διαθήκης μεσίτης, ἥτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις
νενομοθέτηται. 7. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη ἦν ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἂν

[1] τετευχε with ℵcBDcE; τευχε with ℵ*AD*KL, 80, 116; τετυχηκεν with P, 17. Veitch gives τετυχηκα as the Homeric form, τετευχα Arist. and Demosth.; τετυχα here and in Diod., "late if correct".

Ver. 6. **νυνὶ δὲ . . .** "But, as it is, He hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much He is also mediator of a better covenant, which has been enacted upon better promises." **νυνὶ δὲ**, *i.e.*, He not being on earth, the **δὲ** pointing back to **μὲν** in ver. 4. For **νυνὶ δὲ** in its *logical* significance, *cf.* ix. 26; xi. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Arist. *Ethics*, I. iv. 4. **διαφορωτέρας λειτουργίας**, more excellent, as what is heavenly or real is more excellent than what is earthly and symbolic. **ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστιν διαθήκης μεσίτης**, the ministry being a part of the work of mediating the better covenant, it must participate in the superior excellence of that covenant. And the superiority of the covenant consists in this, that it has been legally based on better promises. Had Paul so connected the law and the promises, a quip might have been supposed; but this writer uses **νενομ.** in its ordinary sense without any allusion to its etymology. What these "better promises" are he shows in vv. 8-12. **ἥτις** introduces the explanation of the **κρείττονος**, almost equivalent to "inasmuch as it has been, etc." The **μεσίτης** (*cf.* xii. 24) is more comprehensive than the **ἔγγυος** of vii. 22, although **μεσίτης** is Hellenistic for the Attic **μεσέγγυος**, and in *Diod. Sic.* iv. 54 **μεσίτης** has exactly the sense of **ἔγγυος**. The full title in 1 Tim. ii. 5 **μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων** presents the mediator as one who negotiates for both parties, and is something more than a guarantor. Moses was **μεσίτης** of the first covenant (Gal. iii. 19; Exod. xx. 19); so that as already intimated in iii. 1, Christ absorbed in His ministry the work of both Moses and Aaron.

Vv. 7-13. A justification of the establishment of a better covenant, on the grounds (1) that the first covenant was not faultless; (2) that Jeremiah had predicted the introduction of a new covenant (*a*) not like the old, but (*b*) based upon better promises; and (3) that even in Jeremiah's days the first covenant was antiquated by the very title "new" ascribed to that which was then promised.

Ver. 7. **εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη . . .** "For if that first had been faultless, no place would have been sought for a second." **ἡ πρώτη** sc. **διαθήκη. πρώτη** for **προτέρα** as in Acts i. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 47, and this epistle *passim*. The covenant did not accomplish the purpose for which it was enacted; it did not bring men into spiritual and permanent fellowship with God. *Cf.* vii. 11, 19; Gal. iii. 20. **οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος.** "There would not have been—as we know there *was*—any demand for a second" (Farrar). Probably, however, **ἐζητεῖτο** refers to God's purpose, ["Inquisivit Deus locum et tempus opportunum" (Herveius)] not to man's craving; although necessarily the two must concur. **τόπος** is frequently used in the sense of "room" "opportunity" in later Greek, Rom. xv. 23; Luke xiv. 19; and *cf.* especially Rev. xx. 11. **τόπος οὐχ εὑρέθη αὐτοῖς. μεμφόμενος γὰρ . . .** "For finding fault with them He says, Behold, there come days, etc." The **γὰρ** obviously refers to **ἄμεμπτος** and justifies it, "For it is with fault finding, etc." But now the object of the blame is slightly changed. "There is a subtle delicacy of language in the insensible shifting of the blame from the covenant to the people. The covenant itself could hardly be said to be faultless, seeing that it failed to bind Israel to their God; but the true cause of failure lay in the character of the people, not in the law, which was holy, righteous and good" (Rendall). This is the simplest construction and agrees with the ascription of blame in ver. 9. Thayer says "it is more correct to supply **αὐτήν**, *i.e.*, **διαθήκην**, which the writer wishes to prove was not faultless, and to join **αὐτοῖς** with **λέγει**". No doubt this would be more logically consistent, but the question is, What did the writer say? He seems not to distinguish between the covenant and the people who lived under it. The old covenant was faulty because it did not provide for enabling the people to live up to the terms or conditions of it. *It* was faulty inasmuch as it did not sufficiently provide against *their* faultiness. **Ἰδοὺ, κ.τ.λ.** The quotation which here occupies five verses is taken from

f Jer. xxxi. 31, etc.

δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος. 8. [f] μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς[1] λέγει, "Ἰδοὺ, ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα διαθήκην καινήν· 9. οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου· ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ

g Jer. xxxi. 33, etc.; Zach. viii. 8.

ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, λέγει Κύριος. 10. [g] ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἣν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς

[1] αυτοις with ℵ[c]BD[c]EL; αυτους in ℵ*AD*KP, 17, 39, 114, 137, Thdrt., Chrys.

Jeremiah xxxviii. 31-34 in LXX, xxxi. 31-34 A.V. **ἡμέραι ἔρχονται** is a frequent formula in Jeremiah. **καὶ** "The ubiquitous Hebrew *and*, serving here the purpose of the **ὅτε** which might have been expected" (Vaughan). **συντελέσω**, the LXX has **διαθήσομαι**, and Augustine (*De Spir. et Lit.* xix.) thinks this word (consummabo) is chosen for the sake of emphasising the sufficiency of the New Covenant. So Delitzsch: "Our author seems here to have purposely selected the **συντελέσω** to express more clearly the conclusive perfecting power of the new covenant of the gospel." So, too, Weiss, who also calls attention to the fact that it is followed by **ἐπὶ** as in the expression **συντελ. τ. ὀργὴν ἐπὶ . . .** But in the face of the occurrence in Jer. xxxiv. 8, (LXX, xli. 8) of the expression **συντελέσαι διαθήκην πρὸς . . .**, it is precarious to maintain that our author in selecting this word meant more than "complete a covenant". **ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ . . .**, comprehensive of the whole people of God. Their blameworthy rupture had not severed them from God's grace and faithfulness. **διαθήκην καινήν**, the expression first occurs in our Lord's institution of the sacrament, **τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τ. αἵματί μου**, repeated in 1 Cor. xi. 25. In 2 Cor. iii. 6, the **καινὴ διαθ.** is contrasted with **τ. παλαιᾶς διαθ.** of ver. 14. The new covenant is also called **νέα** in xii. 24; **καινή** properly meaning new in character, **νέα** young or new in date. As in ver. 7 the condemnation of the old implied a promise of the new; so in ver. xiii., the promise of the new is considered as involving the condemnation of the old.

Ver. 9. **οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην . . .** "Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers." These words express negatively wherein the **καινότης** of the covenant consists. It was not to be a repetition of that which had failed. It was to be framed with a view to avoiding the defects of the old. It must not be such a covenant as dealt in symbols and externals. That former covenant is further defined in the words **ἣν ἐποίησα . . .**, a clause which is intended to remind the readers that it was through no lack of power or grace on God's part that the covenant had failed. His intention and power to fulfil His part was put beyond doubt by the deliverance from Egypt. **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τ. χειρὸς αὐτῶν . . .** "sicut nutrix apprehendit manum parvuli, vel qui de fovea per manum attrahit aliquem sive secum ducit" (Herveius). The construction determined by the Hebrew, which, however, has the infinitive not the participle, is, according to Winer (710) "perhaps unusual, but not incorrect." Buttmann, however, (316) condemns it as "a perfectly un-Greek construction" and "nothing more than a thoughtless imitation of the original Hebrew, of which no other similar example is to be found in the N.T." *Cf.* Baruch, ii. 28 **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντειλαμένου σου, κ.τ.λ.** *Cf.* Viteau, *Gram.* p. 209-10. On **ἐπιλαβ.** see ii. 16. **ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν** "because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord". Both parties abandoned the covenant and so it became null. Bengel's note on this clause is this: "Correlata, uti ver. 10, ex opposito: *Ero eis in Deum, et illi erunt mihi in populum;* sed ratione inversa: populus fecerat initium tollendi foederis prius: 'in novo omnia et incipit et perficit Deus". The pronouns are emphatic in both clauses **κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν** representing וְאָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי בָם which in A.V. is rendered "although I was an husband to them." Grotius suggests a variant in the Hebrew as giving rise to the translation **ἠμέλησα** but it seems to be justified by an analogous Arabic expression (see Moses Stuart *in loc.* and Bleek).

Ver. 10. **ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἣν διαθήσομαι . . .** "For this is

ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει Κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς Θεὸν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι εἰς λαόν. 11. [h]καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν [1]ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων, Γνῶθι τὸν Κύριον· ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσί με, ἀπὸ μικροῦ

h x. 16; Joan. vi. 45, 65. 1 Joan. ii. 27.

[1] T.R. in P, f, vg., Syrp.mg; πολιτην in ℵABDEKL, d, e, Copt.

the covenant which I will covenant with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord." The ὅτι justifies the differentiation of this covenant from the Sinaitic, and the ascription to it of the term "new". It also introduces the positive aspect of the newness of the covenant. This consists in three particulars. It is inward or spiritual; it is individual and therefore universal; it is gracious and provides forgiveness. **μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας**, *i.e.*, after the days, spoken of ver. 8, have arrived. **διδοὺς νόμους μου . . .** The LXX (vat.) has **διδοὺς δώσω**, but this writer omits **δώσω** in x. 16 as well as here. The participle cannot be attached either to **διαθήσομαι** or to **ἐπιγράψω** without intolerable harshness. We must, therefore, suppose that the writer was simply quoting from the Alexandrian text which omits **δώσω** (so also Q = Codex Marchalianus), and does not concern himself about the elegance or even correct grammar of the words. See Buttmann, p. 291. **νόμους μου.** "The plural occurs again in the same quotation, x. 16, but not elsewhere in the N.T.; nor does the plural appear to be found in any other place of the LXX as a translation of תּוֹרָה" Westcott. **εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν.** "In Aristotle **διάνοια** includes *all* intellect, theoretical and practical, intuitive and discursive" (Burnet's *Nic. Eth.*, p. 276). Plato defines it in *Soph.* 263 E thus: **ὁ μὲν ἐντὸς τῆς ψυχῆς πρὸς αὑτὴν διάλογος ἄνευ φωνῆς γιγνόμενος.** In N.T. it is sometimes used for the "mind," as in Eph. iv. 18, 1 Pet. i. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 1; sometimes for the thoughts produced in the mind, Eph. ii. 3; sometimes for the inner man generally, as in Luke i. 51, Col. i. 21. And in this sense here. **καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν** "and on their heart". **καρδίας** may be either genitive singular, or accusative plural, both constructions being found after **γράφειν ἐπὶ.** The meaning is that God's law, instead of being written on tables of stone, should under the new covenant be written on the spirit and desires of man. "Unde significavit eos non forinsecus habere, sed ipsam legis justitiam dilecturos" (Atto). This "better promise" involves a new spirit, effecting that man's own will shall concur with the divine. *Cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 3. **καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς . . .** "and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people". For the distinction between the Hebraistic construction **ἔσομαι εἰς** and the legitimate Greek **εἶναι** or **γένεσθαι εἰς** see Buttmann, p. 150. This of course was the aim of the old covenant as well, and is expressed in the original promise, Exod. vi. 7: "I will take you to myself as my people, and I shall be to you a God". See also Jerem. vii. 23. xi. 4. This is the ultimate statement of the end or aim of all religion.

Ver 11. **καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν. . . .** "And they shall not teach, each man his fellow-citizen and each man his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' for all shall know me from small to great among them". This second "better" promise follows on the first as its natural consequence. The inward acceptance of God's will involves the knowledge of God. In the new covenant all were to be "taught of God" (Isa. liv. 13, Jo. vi. 45) and independent of the instruction of a privileged class. Under the old covenant, none but the educated scribe could understand the minutiæ of the law with which religion was identified. The elaborate ritual made it impossible for the private individual to know whether a ram or a pigeon was the appropriate sacrifice for his sin, or whether his sin was mortal or venial. A priest had to be consulted. Under the new covenant intermediates were to be abolished. The knowledge of God was to lie in the heart alongside of the love of parent or friend, and would demand for its expression no more external instruction than those primal, instinctive and home-grown affections. **οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν,** "The intensive **οὐ μὴ** (of that which *in no wise* will or shall happen) is sometimes—indeed most commonly—joined with the conjunctive aorist, sometimes with the conjunctive present, sometimes also with the indicative future". Winer, p. 634, who also discusses Hermann's canon and Dawes' regarding this form. **εἰδήσουσιν,** for

αὐτῶν ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν· 12. [1]ὅτι ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι." 13. Ἐν τῷ λέγειν "Καινὴν," πεπαλαίωκε τὴν πρώτην· τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ.

i Rom. xi. 27.

IX. 1. [a]ΕΙΧΕ μὲν οὖν καὶ [1] ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ [2] δικαιώματα λατρείας,

a Exod. xxv. 8.

[1] και in ℵADEKLP, d, e, f, vg., Syrp, Arm.; om. in B, 3, 38, 52, Syrsch, Copt., Thphyl.

[2] σκηνη omitted in ℵABDEKLP, f, vg., and by T., Tr., WH, R.; found in 47, 73, 74, 80, 137, Thdrt.

this form of the future Veitch (p. 216) quotes Homer, Theognis, Herodotus, Isocrates. **ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου**, an expression commonly used in LXX to denote universality, Gen. xix. 11, where possibly it is equivalent to **ἀπὸ νεανίσκου ἕως πρεσβυτέρου** of ver. 4; 1 Sam. xxx. 19, where it is used of spoils of war. Gesenius (117, 2) understands the adjectives as superlatives.

Ver. 12. **ὅτι ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν . . .** "For I will be merciful to their iniquities, and their sins will I remember no more." This third better promise is united to the former by **ὅτι**, showing that the forgiveness of sins or God's grace is fundamental to any possible renewal and maintenance of covenant.

Ver. 13. **ἐν τῷ λέγειν Καινήν.** "In saying 'New,' He hath antiquated the first; and that which is antiquated and growing old is near extinction [lit. disappearance]." That is to say, by speaking in the passage quoted, ver. 8, of a new covenant, God brands the former as old. Thus even in Jeremiah's time the Mosaic covenant was disparaged. The fact that a new was required showed that it was insufficient. It was condemned as antiquated. And that which is antiquated and aged has not much longer to live. **πεπαλαίωκεν**, the active is found in LXX, Job. ix. 5; xxxii. 15, etc.; the mid. is common, in Plato and elsewhere in the sense of "growing old". **ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ**, *cf.* **ἐγγὺς κατάρας**, vi. 8. **ἀφανισμός**, is suggestive of utter destruction, abolition; thus in *Polyb.* v. 11, 5 it is joined with **ἀπώλεια**. *Cf. Diod. Sic.* v. 32, **ἀποκτείνουσιν, ἢ κατακαίουσιν, ἢ τισιν ἄλλαις τιμωρίαις ἀφανίζουσι.**

Chapter IX. Ver. 1-14. The insufficiency of the first covenant is further illustrated from the character of its ordinances. For it was not devoid of elaborate and impressive appointments and regulations for worship, but these only pictured their own inefficiency. Especially did the exclusion from the holiest place of all but the High Priest, who himself could only enter once a year, and with blood, signify that so long as these ordinances remained there could be no perfect approach of the worshipper to God. But this approach was achieved by Christ who ministered in the tabernacle not made with hands, and by His own blood cleansed the conscience and thus brought men into true fellowship with God.

Chapter IX. Ver. 1. **Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη . . .** "Even the first covenant, however, had ordinances of worship and the holy place suitable to this world," *i.e.*, as hinted in viii. 2, a tent pitched by man, constructed with earthly materials, "of this creation," ver. 11., and thus appealing to sense. Farrar renders "and its sanctuary—a material one". **οὖν** is continuative, and might almost be rendered "to resume". **μὲν** find its correlative **δὲ** in ver. 6; the first covenant had, indeed, a sanctuary with elaborate arrangements, but after all it was only a symbol. That **διαθήκη**, not **σκηνή**, is to be understood after **πρώτη**, is demanded by the context and is now universally recognised. So Chrysostom, **ἡ πρώτη, τίς; ἡ διαθήκη.** Of the reading **σκηνή** Calvin says, "nec dubito, quin aliquis indoctus lector, pro sua inscitia . . . perperam addiderit." **εἶχε** at first sight seems to require us to date the epistle after the destruction of Jerusalem, but it is quite possible that, as Delitzsch says, the writer is looking back upon the old from the platform of the new covenant. "The author in saying *had* merely looks back from his own historical position to the Mosaic tabernacle and its ordinances, which are everywhere assumed as the standard of the O.T. things; the past 'had' no more implies that the O.T. ministry had passed away in fact or even in principle, than the present 'go in' (ver. 6) implies the reverse" (Davidson.) **δικαιώματα λατρείας. δικ-**

τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν· 2. [b]Σκηνὴ γὰρ κατεσκευάσθη, ἡ πρώτη, ἐν ᾗ ἥ τε λυχνία καὶ ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων· ἥτις λέγεται ἅγια[1]. 3. μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα σκηνὴ ἡ

b Exod. xxv. 30, et xxvi. 1, etc., et xxxvi. 1, etc.; Lev. xxiv. 5.

[1] Add αγιων AD*E, d, e.

αιώματα is used, because the writer wishes to draw attention to the fact that the ritual of the first covenant was divinely appointed. He does this because he means to point out (vv. 8, 9) that the Holy Spirit intended these arrangements to be a parable of their own incompetence and transitory nature. κοσμικόν is best illustrated in Rendel Harris' *Teaching of the Apostles*, p. 71 ff. He has collected a number of passages from early Christian writers which show that a "cosmic" mystery or symbol was "a symbol or action wrought upon the stage of this world to illustrate what was doing or to be done on a higher plane". His quotation from Athanasius is especially convincing **Ὥσπερ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ κυρίῳ, οὕτω καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν πᾶσι. ἀπ' αὐτῶν γὰρ τῶν κοσμικῶν, ἐὰν θέλωμεν, καὶ τὰ ἄνω νοοῦμεν.** This significant word standing at the close of the sentence sufficiently indicates the incompetence of the whole. The first covenant had its holy place but it was κοσμικόν. For the same reason he goes on to enumerate the articles contained in the ἅγιον. He wishes to bring before us the care with which all its arrangements were made: nothing was haphazard and meaningless. The succeeding verses are indeed the resumption of viii. 5, "See that you make *all* things according to the type shown thee in the mount".

Ver 2. σκηνὴ γὰρ κατεσκευάσθη . . . "For a tent was constructed, the fore-tent, in which were" its appropriate contents. σκηνή, a tent. "Observandum est in primis hanc descriptionem non ad templum sed ad tabernaculum accommodari; quia nimirum noster hic scriptor ea proprie quae Moses secundum exemplar ipsi in monte propositum fabricavit, cum rebus ipsis coelestibus comparat" (Beza). On the construction in which the noun is first conceived indefinitely and is then more clearly defined by the attributive, whose import thus receives special prominence, see Winer, p. 174. ἡ πρώτη, the outer, that into which anyone *first* entered, twice the size of the inner and entered from the east (see Macgregor on Exodus, and appendix by Gillies on construction of tabernacle). Large tents were usually divided into an outer and an inner, a first and a second. And a tent being windowless, ἡ λυχνία was a necessary article of furniture; the lamp-stand, or "candlestick" reminding men that the light of day, the light common to all, was not sufficient to guide to God. *Cf.* Exod. xxv. 31-39; and Zech., c. iv. καὶ ἡ τράπεζα for the making of the table instructions are recorded in Exod. xxv. 23-30, concluding with the injunction "Thou shalt set upon the table showbread before me alway." In Lev. xxiv. 6 it is called "the pure table," because made of "pure" gold. καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων "and the setting forth of the loaves" called in Exod. xl. 23 (P.) "loaves of the setting forth". In Exod. xxv. 30 the command is given **ἐπιθήσεις ἐπὶ τ. τράπεζαν ἄρτους ἐνωπίους ἐναντίον μου**, the loaves here being called לֶחֶם פָּנִים bread of the face or presence. In Lev. xxiv. 5-9 minute instructions for their composition are given and for their "setting forth," and it is added **ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενα τ. Κυρίου.** In 1 Chron. the loaves are called **τ. προθέσεως** translating לֶחֶם הַמַּעֲרֶכֶת bread of the row. On the meaning of the "show bread" see Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*, 207 ff. "The table of show bread has its closest parallel in the *lectisternia* of ancient heathenism, when a table laden with meats was spread beside the idol." "But the idea that the gods actually consume the solid food that is deposited at their shrines is too crude to subsist without modification beyond the savage state of society; the ritual may survive, but the sacrificial gifts . . . will come to be the perquisite of the priests". *Cf.* Warde Fowler's *Roman Festivals*, 215-20. ἥτις λέγεται ἅγια. "The qualitative relative directs attention to the features of the place which determine its name as 'Holy'" (Westcott). ἅγια is neuter plural, as in ver. 3. So Theodoret rejecting the reading ἁγία. For this name see Lev. x. 4; Num. iii. 22; but in LXX always with the article, here omitted, possibly, to bring out more prominently the holy character of the place.

Ver. 3. μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον

λεγομένη ἁγια ἁγίων, 4. [c] χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον, καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης περικεκαλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ, ἐν ᾗ στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα, καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστή-

c Exod. xvi. 33, et xxv. 10, 21, et xxvi. 33, et xxxiv. 29; Num. xvii. 10; 1 Reg. viii. 9; 2 Par. v. 10.

καταπέτασμα. "And after the second veil the tent which is called 'Holy of Holies,'" not, as Westcott, "a tent [was prepared] which is called," for "when attributives are placed after with the article, the article before the substantive is dropped" (Buttmann, p. 92). The participle with the article as usual takes the place of a relative clause. **μετὰ** in a local sense [non-classical, Blass, p. 133], which is here closely akin to the temporal = after the entrant has passed the second veil. The second veil separated the Holy place from the Holy of Holies, and as being the significant veil was sometimes spoken of without **δεύτερον,** simply as **τὸ καταπέτασμα,** see chap. vi. 19; Mat. xxvii. 51, etc. Instructions for making and hanging it are given in Exod. xxvi. 31-35; and in ver. 36 the outer veil is described. The outer veil is sometimes called **καταπέτασμα** but more commonly **ἐπίσπαστρον,** Exod. xxvi. 36, xxxv. 15 etc. The inner tent was called the **ἅγια ἁγίων,** translating קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים which in Hebrew idiom is equivalent to a superlative.

Ver. 4. **χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον. . . .** The inner tent is characterised by its furnishings, a golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant. **θυμιατήριον** is rendered both in A.V. and R.V. by "censer" following the Vulgate, "aureum habens thuribulum;" Grotius "**θυμ**: hic non est mensa, sed impositum mensae *batillum*;" and others. In doing so the usage of the LXX is followed, for in 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, Ezek. viii. 11, 4 Mac. vii. 11—the only instances of its occurrence—it renders מִקְטֶרֶת = censer; while "altar of incense" is rendered by **θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος,** see Lev. iv. 7, 1 Chron. vii. 49, etc. But Philo (p. 512 A, 668, C), Josephus *Ant.*, iii. 6, 8, and the versions of Symmachus and Theodotion in Exod. xxxi. use **θυμιατήριον** for "altar of incense". Besides, the form of the word indicates that it could be used of anything on which incense is offered. It was, therefore, understood of the "altar" by Clement Alex. and other fathers; by Calvin, who says, "quo nomine altare suffitus vel thymiamatis potius intelligo quam thuribulum;" and by most modern scholars. As has frequently been urged it is incredible that in describing the furniture of the tabernacle there should be no mention of the altar of incense. Difficulty has been felt regarding the position here assigned to it, for in fact it stood outside the veil; and the author has been charged with error. But the change from **ἐν ᾗ** of ver. 2 to **ἔχουσα** is significant, and indicates that it was not precisely its local relations he had in view, but rather its ritual associations, "its close connection with the ministry of the Holy of Holies on the day of atonement, of which he is speaking" (Davidson). The altar was indeed so strictly connected with the Sancta Sanctorum that in the directions originally given for its construction this was brought out (Exod. xxx. 1-6). "Thou shalt set it before the veil (**ἀπέναντι τ. καταπετάσματος**) that is over the ark of the testimony," and in ver. 10, "it is most holy (**ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων**) to the Lord". In 1 Kings vi. 20 it is also said of Solomon that he made the altar of incense **κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ δαβὶρ** "in front of the oracle," which brings it into direct connection with the ark *Cf.* also 1 Kings ix. 25. **χρυσοῦν,** although made of shittim wood it was overlaid with gold and is often called "golden". Here emphasis is laid upon its golden appearance as being worthy of its use. **καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν . . .** "and the ark of the covenant covered all over with gold". **κιβωτός,** a box or chest (in Aristoph. *Wasps*, 1056, wardrobe) or ark (a word still used in Scotland, where the meal-chest is known as the meal-ark). In LXX and N.T. appropriated to the chest in the Holy of Holies or to the ark in which Noah was rescued. For its construction see Exod. xxv. 10. **περικεκ. πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ** representing "inside and outside" **ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν χρυσώσεις αὐτήν** of Exod. xxv. 11. Here called **τῆς διαθήκης** because in it were kept **αἱ πλάκες τ. διαθήκης** "the tables of the covenant" on which were written the ten commandments, the sum of the terms to which the people swore on entering the covenant. Therefore called in Exod. xxxi. 18 **πλάκες**

σασα, καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης· 5. [d] ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς Χερουβὶμ[1] δόξης, κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον· περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστι νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος. 6. [e] Τούτων δὲ οὕτω κατεσκευασμένων, εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν διαπαντὸς εἰσίασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰς λατρείας ἐπι-

d Exod. xxv. 18.

e Num. xxviii. 3.

[1] χερουβειν in BD^{c}E; χερουβειμ AP, 37. The LXX also has the same variants.

μαρτυρίου. These tables were, in LXX, first spoken of as πυξία (τὰ πυξία τὰ λίθινα, Exod. xxiv. 12). They are called πλάκες in Exod. xxxi. 18. Paul also uses this word in contrasting the stone tables of the Law with the σάρκιναι πλάκες of the heart. In 1 Kings viii. 9 it is stated that when Solomon's Temple was dedicated these tables were the sole contents of the ark. In the tabernacle, however, as here described the ark also contained στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα "a golden jar containing manna," as directed in Exod. xvi. 33, 34, Moses said to Aaron λάβε στάμνον χρυσοῦν ἕνα, where it is masculine; in Aristoph. *Plut.* 545, feminine (see Stephanus, s.v.). Usually it was of earthenware and used for holding wine, honey, etc. τὸ μάννα in Exod. μάν is the form used; in the other books μάννα. καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστήσασα, as related in Num. xvii. 1-10, when the rods of the tribes were laid up before the Lord to determine who were the legitimate priests, ἰδοὺ ἐβλάστησεν ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρών. Chrysostom remarks that the contents of the ark were venerable and significant memorials of Israel's rebellion; the tables of the covenant for the first were broken on account of their sin; the manna reminding them of their murmuring; the rod that budded of their jealousy of Aaron.

ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς χερουβεὶν δόξης . . . "And over it [the ark] Cherubim of glory, overshadowing the mercy-seat" ["obumbrantia propitiatorium" (Vulg.)]. According to Exod. xxv. 18-22, the Cherubim were to be two in number, made of gold, one at each end of the ark, looking towards one another, and overshadowing the mercy seat with their wings [συσκιάζοντες ἐν ταῖς πτέρυξιν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου]. The Cherubim seem to have symbolised, in the manner of the Assyrians and Egyptians, the creatures of God, all that is best in creation, by a combination of excellences found in no single creature. In Ezekiel, i. 10 they have four faces, of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, representing respectively intelligence, strength, steadfastness, rapidity. But *cf.* Davidson, p. 173 and Cheyne's art. in *Encycl. Bibl.* δόξης, the Cherubim are here called "of glory," probably because closely attached to and, as it were, attendant upon, the place of the manifestation of the divine glory. ["Als *Träger* der Herrlichkeit, in welcher die göttliche Gnadengegenwart sich kund that" (Weiss).] τὸ ἱλαστήριον. In Exod. xxv. 17 Moses is instructed to make a golden cover [כַּפֹּרֶת] to be laid upon the lid of the ark, and this instruction the LXX renders by the words ποιήσεις ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα χρυσίου καθαροῦ. The word ἐπίθεμα alone, without any qualifying adjective, would have been an adequate translation of כַּפֹּרֶת, for both words mean "a cover". But ἐπίθεμα is nowhere else used in the LXX to translate כַּפֹּרֶת, which is regularly translated by ἱλαστήριον, although this word does not express the idea of a material covering. [Philo more than once remarks upon this. In *De Profug.*, 19, in speaking of symbols, he says τῆς ἴλεω δυνάμεως τὸ ἐπίθεμα τῆς κιβωτοῦ, καλεῖ δὲ αὐτὸ ἱλαστήριον. And in *Vit. Mos.* iii. 68, ἧς ἐπίθεμα ὡσανεὶ πῶμα τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἱλαστήριον.] The reason of this usage is to be found in the fact that this "cover" was sprinkled with blood on the day of atonement, and came, therefore, to be associated with the *covering* of sin. Indeed, the Hebrew word which denotes the material covering is that which is regularly used to express the covering of sin. The original ἐπίθεμα thus became a ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα and finally ἱλαστήριον. (See Deissmann, *Bibelstud.* p. 121-132.) περὶ ὧν . . . μέρος "of which we cannot now speak in detail". ἔστιν, as commonly in classical Greek = ἔξεστι. κατὰ μέρος = one by one. Examples in Wetstein and Bleek (see especially Plato, *Theaet.* 157B, where it is opposed to ἄθροισμα).

Vv. 6-10. Significance of these arrangements.

Ver. 6. τούτων δὲ οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων . . . "And after these things had been thus furnished, into the fore-tent, indeed, the priests enter con-

τελοῦντες· 7. [f] εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος, ὃ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ

f ver. 25; Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi. 2, 15, 34.

tinually in the performance of their services, but into the inner the High Priest alone once a year not without blood." This is the particular **δικαίωμα λατ.** (ver. 1) to which he wishes to direct attention, the inaccessible sacredness of the inner chamber, as revealed in the constant openness of the outer-tent, the mysterious closeness of the inner. **κατεσκευασμένων** perfect; the arrangements were made with a view to the abiding service of the first covenant. **διαπαντὸς,** continuously, opposed to **ἅπαξ.** ver. 7. **εἰσίασιν** present tense, as in Homer, Aristoph., Plato, Xenophon. It is not easy to determine whether this present implies the contemporaneous continuance of the services referred to. Tholuck thinks Bleek very "unreasonable" in concluding that it involves that the ark and the services connected with it were extant; but Bleek after reconsideration, finds himself unable to yield the point to "Freund Tholuck". Davidson says, "The present 'go in' does not imply that the Levitical service still continued when this was written; the present is that of the record in Scripture." The Vulgate shows its preference by tendering "introibant". The truth seems to be that although the temple services were yet upheld, the use of the present tense here and in vv. 7, 11, etc., does not involve that. **τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες,** not, as Vulg., "sacrificiorum officia consummantes," for these rather belonged to the court of the priests; but "performing their services" of trimming the lamp and offering incense; see Edersheim, *The Temple; Its ministry, etc.*, p. 130-140. **ἐπιτελεῖν** is used in Herod. and in Diod. Sic., and in Philo, for the accomplishing of religious services but it is not so used in the LXX.

Ver. 7. **εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ . . .** The law is given in Lev. xvi., both negatively and positively; negatively in ver. 2 **μὴ εἰσπορευέσθω πᾶσαν ὥραν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ἐσώτερον τ. καταπετάσματος**—promiscuous or continuous, daily entrance was forbidden; and positively, in ver 34 **ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ,** *i.e.*, one day each year, *viz.*, on the day of Atonement, the tenth of the seventh month the High Priest is to enter. On that day the High Priest was to enter the Holiest at least *thrice*, first with the incense, then with the blood of the bullock which atoned for his own sins and those of his house, and finally with the blood of the goat for the sins of the people. **μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς** in contrast with **οἱ ἱερεῖς** of ver. 6. This point is also emphasised by Philo, *De Mon.*, p. 821 E., where he says that the things inside the veil were hidden from everyone **πλὴν ἑνὶ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ,** and by Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* v. 5, 7) **εἰσῄει ἅπαξ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν μόνος.** See also Lev. xvi. 17. The law was emphasised by the destruction of Nadab and Abhu, Lev. x. 1. The Holiness of the Presence and the difficulty of access was further illustrated and enforced by the demand that sacrifice should open the way **οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος.** This blood was offered, *i.e.*, sprinkled with the finger on the **ἱλαστήριον,** first, the blood of the calf to cleanse from his own sins, and then, the blood of the goat to atone for the people's sins. [**ἑαυτοῦ** is manifestly under the direct government of **ὑπὲρ** and does not follow **ἀγνοημάτων.** This word does not occur in Lev. xvi.; on the contrary the strongest words are used, **ἀνομία, ἁμαρτία, ἀδικία,** but *cf.* v. 2.] These three points, then, bring out the impossibility of free access to the Presence; not **διαπαντὸς** but **ἅπαξ τ. ἐνιαυτοῦ**; not **οἱ ἱερεῖς** promiscuously, but **μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς**; not freely, but **οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος.** This was the **δικαίωμα λατρείας** which could not be neglected under pain of death. What did it signify? **τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τ. πνεύματος . . .** "*this* the Holy Spirit signifying, that the way into the Holy of Holies has not yet been made manifest, while the fore-tent has still a place". **δηλοῦντος,** the Holy Spirit is viewed as the author of the ritual and as meaning to teach by every part of it. Vaughan compares 1 Pet. i. 11 and adds, "As there O.T. *prophecy*, so here O.T. *ritual*, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit." **τὴν τ. ἁγίων ὁδὸν** "the way into the Holiest" as in viii. 2. Access to the Holy of Holies being thus barred was an intimation that the true access to God had not yet been furnished and that therefore worship and fellowship with God (that is, religion) were not yet perfect. [*Cf.* Theoph. **ἡ τ. ἁγίων ὁδός, τουτέστιν ἡ εἰς τ. οὐρανὸν εἴσοδος.** Weiss, "der Weg zum himmlischen Heiligthum".] So long as the fore-tent (**τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς**) has an appointed

λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων 8. [g]τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν, ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν· 9. [h]ἥτις παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, καθ' ὃν[1] δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται, μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα, 10. [1]μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, καὶ δικαιώμασι[2] σαρκὸς, μέχρι

g x., 19, 20; Joan. xiv. 6.
h Acts xiii. 39; Gal. iii. 21.
i Lev. xi. 2; Num. xix. 7, etc.

[1] ον in DcEKLP; ην in ℵABD*, 17, 27, 71, 73, 137, f, vg.

[2] δικαιωμασι in DcEKL, f, vg., Syrp; δικαιωματα (sine και) in ℵABP, 6, 17, 27, 31, 73, 137.

place as part of the Divine arrangements for worship (**ἐχούσης στάσιν** as in *Polyb.* v. 5, 3) this signifies that the very Presence of God is inaccessible. The very object of the division of the Tabernacle into two rooms, an outer and an inner, was to impress men with the fact that the way of access had not actually been disclosed (**πεφανερῶσθαι**). Hence the appropriateness of the rending of the veil as the symbol that by the perfected work and sacrifice of Christ the new and living way (x. 20) was opened.

Ver. 9. **ἥτις παραβολὴ εἰς . . .** "for this is a parable for the time [then] present," for the contemporary period. **ἥτις** has for its antecedent **σκηνῆς**. This is the simplest construction (*Cf.* Winer, p. 207). That suggested by Primasius and Vaughan—"Which thing (the fact of there being a **πρώτη σκηνὴ** separate from the Holy of Holies) was a parable"—is grammatically admissible. **εἰς τ. καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα**, "for the time being". In the usual division of time into past, present and future, the present was termed **ὁ ἐνεστώς**. But present to whom? Several interpreters reply, To those living under the Christian dispensation. So especially Delitzsch and Alford. But N.T. usage, and especially the usage of this Epistle which speaks of the Christian dispensation as "the coming age" (vi. 5), "the future world" (ii. 5), indicates that "the present time" must refer to the O.T. period. Besides, the opposition to **καιρὸς διορθώσεως** points in the same direction; as also does the clause under **καθ' ἥν**. **εἰς** is here "with reference to". And the meaning is, that the outer tent which did not itself contain God's presence, but rather stood barring access to it, was a parable of the entire dispensation. In other words, this Tabernacle arrangement was a striking symbol of the Mosaic economy which could not of itself effect spiritual approach and abiding fellowship with God. The Levitical **δικαιώματα** themselves, on the ground of which all these arrangements proceed, emphatically declared their own inadequacy. Wrapped up in them was the truth that they could not bring the worshipper into God's presence. **καθ' ἣν δῶρά τε . . .** "in accordance with which [parable] are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot perfect him that doth the service as regards conscience, being only ordinances of the flesh resting upon meats and drinks and divers washings, imposed until a time of rectification". **καθ' ἣν**- referring to **παραβολὴ**; it is in accordance with the parabolic significance of the Tabernacle and its arrangements, that gifts and sacrifices were offered which could only purge the flesh, not the conscience. **μὴ δυνάμεναι**, Winer's note (p. 608) is misleading. *Cf.* Jebb's Appendix to Vincent and Dickson's *Modern Greek*, p. 340. "In later Greek, **μή** tended to usurp the place of **οὐ**," especially with participles. *Cf.* Blass, 255. **κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι** means, to give to the worshipper the consciousness that he is inwardly cleansed from defilement and is truly in communion with God; to bring conscience finally into peace.

Ver. 10. **μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασιν . . . μόνον** evidently introduces the positive aspect of the virtue of the "gifts and sacrifices," thus more closely defining **μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι . . .** the gifts and sacrifices are not able to bring the worshipper into a final rest *as regards conscience*, only having effect so far as regards meats and drinks and divers washings—ordinances of the flesh, not of the conscience, imposed until a time of rectification. The change of preposition from **κατὰ** to **ἐπὶ** need excite no surprise (*cf.* Aristotle's frequent change of preposition, *e.g.*, *Eth. Nic.*, iv. 3, 26); and here there is a slight distinction in the reference. **ἐπὶ** has frequently the meaning "in connection with," "with regard to" as in Luke xii. 52; John xii.

καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα. 11. [k] Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων[1] ἀγαθῶν, διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας

k iii. 1, et iv. 14, et vi. 20, et viii. 1.

[1] μελλοντων in ℵADcEKLP, f, vg., Copt., Basm., Syrp.mg; γενομενων in BD*, d, e, Syrp text. But the former was more likely to be changed into the latter reading than *vice versâ*.

16; Acts xxi. 24 [see especially Donaldson's excellent treatment of this preposition (*Greek Gram.*, p. 518) showing that with the dative it signifies *absolute superposition, i.e., rest upon*, or *close to*, hence addition, subsequence and succession, then "that which is close by us as a suggesting cause, accompaniment, motive, or condition". **ἐπὶ τοῖς τ. φίλων ἀγαθοῖς φαιδροὶ γιγνόμεθα**, "we are cheerful on account of the prosperity of our friends". **ὀνομάζοι δὲ πάντα ταῦτα ἐπὶ ταῖς δόξαις τοῦ μεγάλου ζώου** ".but were to give all these things names from in accordance with) the opinions of the great monster" (Plato, *Rep.* 493, c).] The meaning then is that the virtue (**δυνάμεναι**) of the gifts and sacrifices is only in relation to defilements occasioned by eating and drinking or neglecting the enjoined purifications. **δικαιώματα σαρκὸς** may either be construed as a contemptuous exclamation appended, or it may be softened by **οὖσαι** "which are". **μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως** "usque ad tempus correctionis". **διόρθωσις** is a making straight or right; used by Hippocrates of reducing a fracture, by Aristotle of repairing roads and houses, by Polybius of paying debts, of education, etc. It means, putting things right, bringing matters into a satisfactory state, and is thus used of the introduction of the new covenant, in confirmation of viii. 8. No term could better express this writer's view of the characteristic of Messianic times.

Ver. 11. **Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος . . .** "But Christ having arrived a High Priest of the good things that were to be, He, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this creation, nor yet through blood of he-goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered once for all into the Holy of Holies, and obtained eternal redemption." The main thought of the verse is that Christ has obtained eternal redemption; the **δὲ**, therefore, which introduces it, refers to the inability of the Levitical gifts and sacrifices to perfect the worshipper. The greater efficiency of Christ's ministry results from its being exercised in a more perfect tabernacle and with a truer sacrifice. **παραγενόμενος**, scarcely, as Vulg. "assistens" rather "having arrived," as in Matt. ii. 1, iii. 1, 13; and frequently in Luke and Acts. *Cf.* Isa. lxii. 11. **Ἰδοὺ σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται . . .** Here it is in fulfilment of the expectation aroused by **μέχρι. ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελ.** "The genitive gives the *subject* of the high priestly action. *High Priest, concerned about, ministering in, securing and applying by His ministry* **τὰ μέλλ. ἀγαθά.** The genitive here is nearly equivalent to the accusative **τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν** in ii. 17" (Vaughan). The good things that were to be under the new covenant are specified in viii. 10-12; they surpassed all expectation, however. "The High Priest" of the good things coming, is a notable title. Possibly it is only equivalent to "High Priest of the new covenant," the contents being used to stand for the whole dispensation, but more probably the writer has in view the slender benefits obtained by the Levitical High Priest, and contrasts them with the illimitable good mediated by Christ. **διὰ τῆς . . . σκηνῆς . . . οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως.** The meaning of **διὰ** in ver. 11 favours the understanding of it here not in a local (Weiss, etc.) but an instrumental sense, "by means of". It was because He was High Priest not in the earthly but the heavenly tabernacle that He was able to secure these great results. No doubt **διὰ** in a similar connection in iv. 14 and x. 20 is used locally. But this sense is not so applicable here. Christ is represented here as the High Priest ministering in the tabernacle, not passing through it (*Cf.* Davidson and Westcott). **τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελ. σκηνῆς,** the tabernacle greater and more perfect than that which has been described in the preceding verses, and which has itself been mentioned as the scene of Christ's ministry, viii. 2. This tabernacle is "not made with hands" **οὐ χειροποιήτου,** as in ver. 24; equivalent to **ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος οὐκ ἄνθρωπος,** viii. 2. Our Lord characterised the temple as **χειροποίητον,** Mark lxiv. 58. Being of human manufacture, viii. 2, it could be only a symbolic dwelling for God and a symbolic worship was appropriate. The words **οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως** are added in ex-

σκηνῆς, οὐ χειροποιήτου, τουτέστιν, οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, 12. [l] οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος. 13. [m] εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα

l x. 10; Acts xx. 28; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; 1 Peter i. 19; Apoc. i. 5, et v. 9.

m x. 4; Lev. xvi. 14, 16; Num. xix. 2, 4.

planation, although, as Bleek remarks, they are certainly no clearer than the words they are meant to explain. They are, however, more significant; for they point out that the tabernacle in which Christ ministers does not belong to this world at all, has no place among created things and is thus in striking contrast to the **ἅγιον κοσμικόν** of ver. 1. It must, however, be acknowledged that Field (*Otium Norv.*, p. 229) has shown reason for believing that we should translate "not of ordinary erection". "By **ταύτης** I understand *vulgaris, quae vulgo dicitur*"; and **κτίσις** he sees no occasion to take in any other sense than that in which **κτίζειν** is commonly applied to a city (3 Esd. iv. 53) or to the tabernacle itself (Lev. xvi. 16). This meaning of **ταύτης**, though warranted by the LXX cited by Field is, however, rare; and the sense is a little flat, whereas the other interpretation is full of significance.

Ver. 12. **οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων . . .** Not only was the place of ministry different, the sacrifice offered also was different. "Not without blood," could the High Priest make his annual entry (ver. 7), but it was with the blood of a calf for himself and of a he-goat for the people. In LXX of Lev. xvi. the **τράγος** is uniformly called **χίμαρος** but in Aquila's version **τράγος** is used in ver. 8 and in Symmachus in vv. 8 and 10. **διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος**, "So only could He enter *for us*. As the Eternal Son He has a right there; as the High Priest of man, He enters in virtue of the sacrifice of Himself" (Vaughan). **ἐφάπαξ**, as in vii. 27, in contrast to the ever-recurring annual entrance; and preparing the way for the statement of the last clause, **αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος**. Rutherford (*New Phryn.*, p. 215) says **εὑράμην** for **εὑρόμην** represents a common corruption of late Greek, but Veitch seems to think instances of its occurrence in Attic have been tampered with. See Tholuck *in loc.*; and Blass, *G.G.*, p. 45. Probably the aorist participle here expresses the result of the action of the main verb, **εἰσῆλθεν**. "But it is possible that **εἰσῆλθεν** is used to describe the whole High Priestly act, including both the entrance into the holy place and the subsequent offering of the blood, and that **εὑράμενος** is thus a participle of identical action. In either case it should be translated not *having obtained* as in R.V. but *obtaining* or *and obtained*" (Burton *M. & T.*, 66). [Weiss accurately "Der nachgestellte Participialsatz drückt aus, was in und mit diesem Eingehen geschah".] On the use of the Mid. in N.T. see Thayer, *s.v.* Here it can only mean that Christ obtained salvation by offering Himself. **λύτρωσις** must, in consistency with the passage, be understood of the deliverance from guilt which enabled the worshipper to enter God's presence. From this flow all other spiritual blessings. It is here termed **αἰωνία** in contrast to the deliverance achieved by the Levitical High Priest, which had to be repeated year by year. Christ obtained a redemption which was absolute and for ever valid.

Ver. 13. **εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα . . .** "For if the blood of goats and bulls and an heifer's ashes sprinkling the unclean purify as regards the cleanness of the flesh, how much rather shall the blood of the Christ, who through eternal spirit offered Himself without blemish to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God" The writer thus justifies the affirmation of ver. 12 that by offering His own blood Christ obtained eternal redemption. **σποδὸς δαμάλεως**, the law of purification with the ashes of the **δάμαλις πυρρὰ ἄμωμος** is given in Num. xix., where we find the characteristic words of this verse, **σποδός, ἄμωμος, ἁγνίζω, ῥαντισμός, καθαρός**, but **κοινοῦν** (not used in LXX) is replaced by **ἀκάθαρτος**. **κεκοινωμένους**, "made common," *i.e.*, profane, ceremonially unclean. Defilement was contracted by touching a dead body, or entering into a house in which a corpse was lying, or touching a bone or a tomb; and to enter the Tabernacle while thus defiled was to incur the penalty of being cut off from Israel. The water in which lay the ashes of the burned heifer was therefore provided for purification (**ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ**) and by using it the worshipper was again rendered fit for entrance to the worship of

n vi. 1; Luc. i. 74; Rom. vi. 13; Eph. v. 2; Gal. i. 4, et ii. 20; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Peter i. 19, et iii. 18, et iv. 2; 1 Joan. i. 7; Apoc. i. 5.

τοὺς κεκοινωμένους ἁγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, 14. [n] πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ Θεῷ, καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ

God. ῥαντίζουσα governs κεκοιν. and is not to be translated as if it were a passive; so Vulg., "aspersus inquinatos sanctificat" (*cf.* Calvin and Bengel). ἁγιάζει, the meaning is determined by its use in Num. xix., where it signifies the removal of ceremonial defilement: the taking away of that which rendered the person "common" or "profane," and the qualifying him for again worshipping God. This ἁγιασμός extended πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, "in the direction of" (vi. 11) or "in relation to" (ii. 17, v. 1) (*cf.* Weiss). The flesh is here opposed to "the conscience" of ver. 14. It was only the flesh that was defiled by attending to the dead; and only the flesh that was cleansed by the prescribed sprinkling. Defilement and cleanring were alike symbolic. It was within a well-defined ceremonial limit these sacrifices and washings availed. What kind of water, no matter how mixed with heifer's ashes, could reach and wash the soul?

Ver. 14. πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. . . . The Levitical sacrifices had their congruous effect, the sacrifice of Christ must also have its appropriate result. The blood offered was not of bulls and goats but of "the Christ;" it was not with another's blood (vicarious, ver. 25) but with His own He entered God's presence. His was not a bodily sacrifice but διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου. ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου . . . Θεῷ. This clause is inserted to justify the efficacy of the blood of Christ in cleansing the conscience. It had virtue to cleanse the conscience because it was the blood of one "who through eternal spirit offered Himself blameless to God". How are we to understand διὰ πν. αἰωνίου? Riehm considers it a parellel expression to that of vii. 16, κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, and that it is here used to bring out the idea that Christ having an eternal spirit was thereby able to perform the whole work of atonement, not merely dying on the cross but passing through that death to present Himself before God. So too Davidson, Weiss and others. This involves that προσήνεγκεν refers not to the cross but to the appearance before God, subsequently to the death. And it does not account for the absence of the article. It seems more relevant to the passage and more consistent with the purpose of the clause (to show the ground of the efficacy of the blood of Christ) to understand the words as expressing the spiritual nature of the sacrifice which gave it eternal validity. It had superior efficacy to the blood of bulls and goats because it was not of the flesh merely, but was expressive of the spirit. It is the spirit prompting the sacrifice and giving it efficacy, which the writer seeks to indicate. Over against the "ordinances of the flesh" which made the slaughter of animals compulsory and a mere matter of letting material blood, he sets this wholly different sacrifice which was prompted and inspired by spirit and belonged wholly to the sphere of spiritual and eternal things. [*Spiritus* opponitur conditioni animantum ratione carentium (ver. 13, Bengel); "bezeichnet das Lebensprinzip, in dessen Kraft, von dem beseelt und angetrieben Christus sich opferte" (Kübel)]. It was the spirit underlying and expressed in the sacrifice which gave it all its potency. Spirit is eternal and can alone be efficacious in eternal things. ἑαυτὸν. The Levitical High Priest, as stated in ver. 25, entered the holy place ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ, but Christ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. Also goats and calves were of no great value, but what Christ offered was of infinite value. Two points are brought out by ἑαυτόν. (1) He offered not a vicarious victim; but, as Priest, offered the only true sacrifice, Himself. Therefore His blood had cleansing efficacy. (2) He offered not a cheap animal, but the most precious of sacrifices. προσήνεγκεν, *i.e.*, on the cross; for the clause is an explanation of the value of the blood. *Cf.* ver. 28. ἄμωμον without blemish, perfect, as required in the Levitical sacrifices, but now with an ethical significance, and therefore possessing an ethical validity. This explains how the blood of Christ should not merely furnish ceremonial cleanness but καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, a characterisation of sins suggested by the context. Works that defile; as the touching of a dead body defiled the

νεκρῶν ἔργων, εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι; 15. °Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας. ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη, 16. θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου· 17. ᵖδιαworshipper. Works from which a man must be cleansed before he can enter God's presence. A pause might be made before **ἔργων**, from dead—(not bodies but) works. [**καθαρίζω**, Hellenistic; see Anz. *Subsidia*, 374. In class. **καθαίρω** is used, as in Herod. i, 44, **τὸν αὐτὸς φόνου ἐκάθηρε**, and Æsch. *Choeph.* 72.] This cleansing is preparatory to the worship of the living God **εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι**. The living God, who is all life, can suffer no taint of death in His worshippers. Death moral and physical cannot exist in His presence. **λατρεύειν**, "ad serviendum, in perpetuum, modo beatissimo et vere sacerdotali" (Bengel).

o xii. 24; Acts xiii. 39; Rom. iii. 25, et v. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 5; 1 Peter iii. 18.

p Gal. iii. 15.

Ver. 15. **καὶ διὰ τοῦτο**, "And on this account," that is to say, because, as stated in ver. 14, Christ's blood cleanses the conscience from dead works and thus fits men to draw near to God, **διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν**, "He is mediator of a new covenant". The old covenant with sacrifices which could only cleanse the flesh allowed sins to accumulate. But Christ, as above stated, obtained cleansing from sins, and so laid the essential foundation of a new covenant, viii. 12. **ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου . . .** "that a death having taken place for deliverance from the transgressions [committed] under the first covenant, those who have been called might receive the promised eternal inheritance". Even under the old covenant this inheritance had been promised. A gospel had been preached to them, and they had been invited, iv. 2. God being during that period the covenant God of the people, this involved eternal good. But until their transgressions were atoned for they could not receive the inheritance. The sacrifices under the old covenant could not atone for sin, therefore a new covenant with a death which could atone was necessary; in order that such a death having taken place and their sins being removed they might receive fulfilment of the promise. The retrospective reference of the death of Christ is here affirmed; as in xi. 40 it is stated that without us, *i.e.*, without the Christian dispensation, the O.T. believers could not be perfected.

The words **οἱ κεκλημένοι**, therefore, include not only the Hebrews addressed but all who had lived under the O.T. dispensation. **ἀπολύτρωσιν . . . παραβάσεων**, the genitive is of the object from which redemption is achieved, and **ἐπὶ** is scarcely "against" as in Vaughan, but rather "in the time of," as in ix. 26, Phil. i. 3.

Ver. 16. **ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη . . .** The meaning of these words is doubtful. In the LXX **διαθήκη** occurs about 280 times and in all but four instances translates בְּרִית, covenant. In classical and Hellenistic Greek, however, it is the common word for "will" or "testament" (see especially *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Grenfell and Hunt, Part I., 105, etc., where the normal meaning of the word appears also from the use of **ἀδιάθετος** for "intestate" and **μεταδιατίθεσθαι** for "to alter a will"). Accordingly it has been supposed by several interpreters that the writer, taking advantage of the double meaning of **διαθήκη**, at this point introduces an argument which applies to it in the sense of "will" or "testament," but not in the sense of "covenant"; as if he said, "where a testamentary disposition of property is made, this comes into force only on the decease of the testator". **θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου** "it is necessary that the death of him who made the disposition be adduced". On the very common omission of the copula in the third singular indicative see Buttmann, p. 136. **φέρεσθαι**, "necesse est *afferri* testimonia de morte testatoris" (Wetstein). For passages establishing its use as a term of the courts for the production of evidence, etc., see Field *in loc.* and especially Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 143, **διαθῆκαι δὲ τοῦ Καίσαρος ὤφθησαν φερόμεναι.** (See also Elsner *in loc.*) **φέρειν** is apparently even used for "to register" in the *Oxy. Papyri*, Part II., 244. The reason of this necessity is given in ver. 17. **διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία . . .** "for a testament is of force with reference to dead people, since it is never of any force when the testator is alive". On this interpretation the

θήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μή ποτε[1] ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος. 18. ὅθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται. 19. [q]λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ νόμον[2] ὑπὸ Μωϋσέως παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τράγων, μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου, αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον

q Exod. xxiv. 5, 6; Lev. xvi. 14, 15, 18.

[1] μη ποτε ℵcADcEKLP; μη τοτε ℵ*D*.
[2] T.R. in ℵ*; insert art. with ℵcACD*2.

words mean that before the inheritance, alluded to in ver. 15, could become the possession of those to whom it had been promised, Christ must die. He is thus represented as a testator. The illustration from the general law relating to wills or testaments extends only to the one point that Christ's people could inherit only on condition of Christ's death. The *reason* of Christ's death receives no illustration. He did not die merely to make room for the heir. The objections to this interpretation are (1) the constant Biblical usage by which, with one doubtful exception in Gal. iii., **διαθήκη** stands for "covenant," not for "will". On this point see the strong statement of Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, p. 48. "There can be little doubt that the word must be invariably taken in this sense of "covenant" in the N.T., and especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the LXX as the epistle to the Hebrews". (2) His argument regarding covenants receives no help from usages which obtain in connection with testaments which are not covenants. The fact that both could be spoken of under the same name shows that they were related in some way; but presumably the writer had in view things and not merely words. To adduce the fact that in the case of wills the death of the testator is the condition of validity, is, of course, no proof at all that a death is necessary to make a covenant valid. (3) The argument of ver. 18 is destroyed if we understand vv. 16, 17 of wills; for in this verse it is the first covenant that is referred to.

But is it possible to retain the meaning "covenant"? Westcott, Rendall, Hatch, Moulton and others think it is possible. To support his argument, proving the necessity of Christ's death, the writer adduces the general law that he who makes a covenant does so at the expense of life. What is meant becomes plain in the 18th verse, for in the covenant there alluded to, the covenanting people were received into covenant through death. That covenant only became valid **ἐπὶ νεκροῖς** over the dead bodies of the victims slain as representing the people. Whatever this substitutionary death may have meant, it was *necessary* to the ratification of the covenant. The sacrifices may have been expiatory, indicating that all old debts and obligations were cancelled and that the covenanters entered into this covenant as clean and new men; or they may have meant that the terms of the covenant were immutable; or that the people died to the past and became wholly the people of God. In any case the dead victims were necessary, and without them, **χωρὶς αἵματος**, the covenant was not inaugurated or ratified. Great light has been thrown on this passage by Dr. Trumbull in his *Blood Covenant*, in which he shows the universality of that form of compact and the significance of the blood. The rite of interchanging blood or tasting one another's blood, indicates that the two are bound in one life and must be all in all to one another. On the whole, this interpretation is to be preferred. Certainly it connects much better with what follows. For having shown that by dead victims all covenants are ratified, the writer proceeds **ὅθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται**, "wherefore not even the first,"—although imperfect and temporary—"was inaugurated without blood," *i.e.*, without death. [The perfect here as elsewhere in Hebrews is scarcely distinguishable from the aorist.] Proof that this statement regarding the first covenant is correct he forthwith gives in vv. 19-20.

Ver 19. **λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς. . . .** "For when Moses had spoken to the people every commandment of the law," this being the needful preliminary, that the people might clearly understand the obligations they assumed on entering the covenant, he then took the blood of the calves and the goats, etc. In Exod. xxiv. 3 ff., an account is given of the inauguration of the first covenant. To that narrative certain

καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐρράντισε, 20. [r]λέγων, "Τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς [r] Exod. xxiv. 8; Matt. xxvi. 28.
διαθήκης ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός". 21. [s]καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δὲ [s] Exod. xxix. 36; Lev. viii. 15, 19, et xvi. 14.
καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας τῷ αἵματι ὁμοίως ἐρράντισε. 22. [t]καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρὶς [t] Lev. xvii. 11.

additions of no importance are here made. In Exodus no mention is made of goats, only of **μοσχάρια**. (See Westcott on this discrepancy.) Probably this addition is due to an echo of vv. 12, 13. *Water*, which was added to the blood to prevent coagulation or possibly as a symbol of cleansing; (*cf.* Jo. xix. 34; 1 Jo. v. 6) *scarlet wool*, **κόκκινος**, so called from **κόκκος** "the grain or berry of the *ilex coccifera*" used in dyeing (*cf.* Lev. xiv. 4) and the *hyssop* or wild marjoram on which the wool was tied, are all added as associated with sacrifice in general, and all connected with the blood and the sprinkling. **ἐράντισεν** here takes the place of the **κατεσκέδασε** of Exodus and the action is not confined to the people as in the original narrative but includes **αὐτὸ τὸ βιβλίον**, the book itself, that is, even the book in which Moses had written the words of the Lord, the terms of the covenant. Everything connected with the covenant bore the mark of blood, of death. Again, in ver. 20, instead of the **ἰδοὺ** of the LXX, which literally renders the Hebrew we have **τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα κ.τ.λ.**, a possible echo of our Lord's words in instituting the new covenant, and instead of **διέθετο** of Exod. xxiv. 8 we have **ἐνετείλατο** corresponding with the **ἐντολή** of ver. 19.

Ver. 21. **καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δὲ...** "And he also in like manner sprinkled with the blood the tabernacle and all the instruments of the service". The tabernacle, however, was not yet erected when the covenant was instituted. Delitzsch supposes that a subsequent though kindred transaction is referred to; and colour is given to this supposition by the separation of this verse from ver. 19. But against it is the article in **τῷ αἵματι**, "the blood," apparently the blood defined in vv. 19 and 20; although it is just possible the writer may have meant "the blood" which formed part of the means of service. Neither was it by Moses but by Aaron the tabernacle and the altar were sprinkled with blood and so cleansed on the day of Atonement. When first erected **ἡ σκηνὴ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτῆς** were anointed with oil (Exod. xl. 9) but Josephus records a tradition that it was consecrated not only with oil but also with blood (*Ant.* iii. 8, 6). It seems that the author adopts this tradition, and ascribes to Moses at the original consecration of the tabernacle the cleansing rites which afterwards were annually performed by Aaron on the day of Atonement.

Ver. 22. **καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα...** "And one may almost say that according to the law all things are cleansed with blood, and without blood-shedding is no remission". **σχεδὸν** qualifies the whole clause and not only **πάντα**. Whether it qualifies both clauses, as Bleek, Weiss and others suppose, is more doubtful. Westcott and Delitzsch confine its reference to the first clause. **ἐν αἵματι** "with blood" the usual instrumental **ἐν**. **πάντα**, all things, especially, of course, those that were used in God's worship or brought into His tabernacle. Water was used for cleansing from certain pollutions. **κατὰ τὸν νόμον**, it was not only a contrivance of man but the law of God which enacted that cleansing must be by blood. **καὶ χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας**, "without blood-shedding," a word which occurs only here in Bibl. Greek. See Stephanus *s.v.* In all the instances cited in Stephanus it means the shedding of blood. Rendall, then, is quite wrong in maintaining (after Tholuck and De Wette) that it means, not the shedding but the outpouring of the blood at the foot of the altar. "The essential idea attached to the one act was destruction of life, of the other devotion of the same life to God. Hence the typical significance of the two acts was also quite distinct; outpouring of blood typified in fact, not physical death, but spiritual martyrdom by the surrender of a living will to God in perfect obedience even unto death". Weiss is strictly accurate in his remark, "**αἷμ.** kann ohne eine lokale Näherbestimmung nicht die Ausgiessung des Blutes am Altare bezeichnen". The evidence is furnished by Bleek. The words, if not suggested by, inevitably recall our Lord's words (Matt. xxvi. 28) **τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον**

αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις. 23. Ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι· αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ
u vii. 25; Rom. viii. 34; 1 Joan. ii. 2. ἐπουράνια κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας. 24. [u] οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα ἅγια εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς,[1] ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανὸν, νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ

[1] T.R. CcDb,cEKLP; om. ο with ℵAC*D*, 17, 71, 118.

εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Cleansing was required of everything connected with God's worship, because it was stained through contact with men. And that this stain was guilt is implied in the use of **ἄφεσις.** It is by remission of sin the stain is removed. And according to the great law of Lev. xvii. 11, this remission was attained by the shedding of blood **τὸ γὰρ αἷμα ἀντὶ ψυχῆς ἐξιλάσεται. ἄφεσις** is used absolutely only here and in Mark iii. 29; elsewhere it is used with **ἁμαρτιῶν** or **παραπτωμάτων.** In Luke iv. 18 it signifies "release".

Vv. 23-28. The necessity of cleansing the heavenly sanctuary and the efficiency and finality of Christ's one sacrifice.

Ver. 23. **ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα . . .** "It was necessary, therefore, that the copies indeed of the heavenly things be cleansed with these, but the heavenlies themselves with better sacrifices than these." **ἀνάγκη οὖν,** the **οὖν** carries to its consequence ver. 22; and the necessity arises from the injunction of the law there mentioned. **τὰ μὲν ὑποδ.** the **μὲν . . . δὲ** show that the second clause is that to which attention is to be given, the first clause introducing it. The statement is almost equivalent to "As it was necessary . . . so it was necessary" . . . The **ὑποδείγ.** are the tabernacle and its furnishings, in accordance with viii. 5; which see. **τούτοις,** *viz.*, the things mentioned in ver. 19. **αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια.** If the copies were cleansed by material rites, realities being spiritual and eternal can only be cleansed by what is spiritual and eternal, *cf.* ver 14. **κρείττοσιν θυσίαις,** the plural is suggested by **τούτοις,** and states an abstract inference. But do the "heavenlies" need cleansing? Bruce says, "I prefer to make no attempt to assign a theological meaning to the words. I would rather make them intelligible to my mind by thinking of the glory and honour accruing even to heaven by the entrance there of 'the Lamb of God'. I believe there is more of poetry than of theology in the words. For the writer is a poet as well as a theologian, and on this account, theological pedants, however learned, can never succeed in interpreting satisfactorily this epistle". But it is scarcely permissible to exclude at this point of the author's argument the theological inference that in some sense and in some relation the heavenlies need cleansing. The earthly tabernacle, as God's dwelling, might have been supposed to be hallowed by His presence and to need no cleansing, but being also His meeting-place with men it required to be cleansed. And so our heavenly relations with God, and all wherewith we seek to approach Him, need cleansing. In themselves things heavenly need no cleansing, but as entered upon by sinful men they need it. Our eternal relations with God require purification.

Ver. 24. **οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα. . . .** The connection, indicated by **γὰρ,** is "I say **αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια,** *for* it is not into a holy place constructed by man that Christ has entered, but into heaven itself". Others prefer to connect this verse with **κρείττοσιν θυσίαις.** "Better sacrifices" were needed, for not into, etc. The humanly constructed tabernacle, being made after the divine pattern, viii. 5, is here called **ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν.** According to viii. 5 a **τύπος** of the heavenly realities was shown to Moses, and what he constructed from that model was an **ἀντίτυπον,** answering to the type. But as here used with **τῶν ἀληθ., ἀντίτυπα** (in agreement with **ἅγια**) must mean what we usually speak of as a type, that which corresponds to and prefigures. In the only other instance of its occurrence, 1 Pet. iii. 21, it has the converse meaning, the reality of baptism which corresponds to or is the antitype of the deluge. The **ἀντίτυπα** are contrasted with **αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν,** heaven itself [**αὐτὸν** in contrast to the mere likeness or copy] the ultimate reality, the presence of spiritual and eternal things. "Coelum in quod Christus ingressus est, non est ipsum coelum creatum quodcunque fuerit, sed est coelum in quo Deus est etiam quando coelum creatum nullum est, ipsa

ἡμῶν· 25. [v] οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτὸν, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ· 26. [w] ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου· νῦν[1] δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας,[2] διὰ τῆς θυσίας

[v] ver. 7; Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi 2, 34.
[w] 1 Cor. x. 11; Eph. i. 10; Gal. iv. 4.

[1] νυνι in ℵACP, 37, 39, 47, 73; νυν in DEK.
[2] T.R. CDᶜEKL; insert της with ℵAP, 17, 73.

gloria divina" (Seb. Schmidt in Delitzsch). **νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι . . .** "now to appear openly before the face of God in our behalf". **νῦν** "now," after His completed work on earth, and as his present continuous function; in contrast both to the past ministries, in which face to face communion was impossible, and to Christ's reappearance to men, ver. 28. **ἐμφανισθῆναι τ. προσώπῳ τ. θεοῦ.** The meaning of **ἐμφανίζω** is most clearly seen from such passages as Exod. xxxiii. 18, Jo. xiv. 21. In the passive it means "to be manifest," "to appear openly" or "clearly," "to show one's self," as in Mat. xxvii. 53 of the bodies of the saints, **ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς.** The infinitive is the infinitive of designed result common in N.T., as in classics, especially after verbs of motion, *cf.* Mat. ii. 2, xi. 8, etc. The aorist may here be used to denote that "the manifestation of Christ, in whom humanity is shown in its perfect ideal before the face of God is 'one act at once'"; but this is doubtful. The force of **ἐμφαν.** is strengthened still more by the emphatic **τ. προσώπῳ τ. θεοῦ.** In the earthly sanctuary the law was **τὸ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ὀφθήσεται** (Exod. xxxiii. 23) but **ἐν νεφέλῃ ὀφθήσομαι ἐπὶ τ. ἱλαστηρίου** (Lev. xvi. 2). In Ps. xlii. 2 we find indeed **πότε ἥξω καὶ ὀφθήσομαι τ. προσώπῳ τ. θεοῦ**; but this is the non-literal expression of a poet. In the present passage the words are not the loose expression of the ordinary worshipper but are meant to be taken literally. And the intentionally emphatic character of the whole phrase is best accounted for by the fact that the darkness and clouds of incense in the old sanctuary were meant as much to veil the unworthiness of the priest from God as the glory of God from the priest. Now Christ appears before God face to face with no intervening cloud. Perfect fellowship is attained by His perfect and stainless offering of Himself. All is clear between God and man. For it is **ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν** "for us" He enters this presence and fellowship; not that He alone may enjoy it, but that we may enter into the rest and blessedness that He has won for us.

Ver. 25. **οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις. . . .** "Nor yet [did He enter in] in order to offer Himself repeatedly," that is, He did not enter in for a brief stay from which He was to return to renew His sacrifice. Westcott holds that the "offering" corresponds with the offering of the victim upon the altar, not with the bringing of the blood into the Holy of Holies. He refers to ver. 14 **ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν,** to ver. 28, and also to x. 10. Similarly Weiss and others. But in ix. 7 **προσφέρει** distinctly refers to the bringing in and application of the blood in the Holy of Holies, and the context of the present passage seems decidedly to make for the same interpretation. The sequence of the **ἵνα** clause after **εἰσῆλθεν**; the analogy presented in the clause under **ὥσπερ**; and the consequence stated under **ἐπεὶ** (ver. 26) all combine in favouring this meaning. The High Priest enters the Holiest annually, but Christ's entering in was of another kind, not requiring repetition. The reason for the reiterated entering in of the High Priest, as well as the possibility of it, is given in the words **ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ. ἐν**: "The High Priest was, as it were, surrounded, enveloped, in the life sacrificed and symbolically communicated" (Westcott). It is safer to take **ἐν** in its common instrumental sense: the blood was the instrument which enabled the High Priest to enter. The reason why the entrance had to be annually renewed is given in x. 4. The same contrast between **αἷμα ἀλλότριον** and **αἷμα ἴδιον** is found in ix. 12. A sacrifice of blood not one's own is necessarily imperfect, Christ's entrance to God being **διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος** and **διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου** had eternal efficacy.

Ver. 26. **ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν . . .** "Since in that case he must often have suffered since the creation." If Christ's one offering of Himself were not eternally efficacious, if it required periodical renewal, then this demanded periodical sacrifice. It was "not without blood"

αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται. 27. καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις· 28. [x] οὕτως [1] ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ
προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς
ἁμαρτίας ὀφθήσεται τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς σωτηρίαν.

x Matt. xxvi. 28: Rom. v. 6, 8, 15, et vi. 10; 1 Peter iii. 18.

[1] Insert καὶ with ℵACDEKLP.

the entrance was made, and if the entrance required repetition, so must the sacrifice be repeated. And as sin prevailed **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου,** the **παθεῖν** must also date from the first. The contrast is with the one offering **ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ κ.τ.λ.** "If his offering of Himself were not independent of time and valid as a single act, if it were valid only for the generation for whom it is immediately made, then in order to benefit men in the past, He must have suffered often, indeed in each generation of the past" (Davidson). **νυνὶ δὲ ἅπαξ . . .** "But now once at the consummation of the ages He has been manifested for sin's abolition by His sacrifice". **νυνὶ,** "as things are," in contrast to the case supposed in ver. 25, the possibility of His repeated entrance and sacrifice. For the word, see viii. 6. **ἅπαξ** not **πολλάκις,** vv. 25, 26; and this, **ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων** [for **ἐπὶ** in this use see Winer, p. 489] at that period of history in which all that has happened since the foundation of the world (**ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου**) finds its interpretation and adjustment. If there was to be one sacrifice for all generations, the occurrence of that sacrifice itself marked the period as the consummation. It closes the periods of symbolism, expectation and doubt, suggesting, perhaps, the word **πεφανέρωται** for Christ's appearance, as that which was dimly foreshadowed, blindly longed for. **εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας,** The object of Christ's appearance, the abolition of sin, made the repetition of His sacrifice unnecessary. In vii. 28 **ἀθέτησις** is used of permanent displacement, removal, or setting aside, that is, abolition. **τῆς ἁμαρτίας** of sin, in its most general and comprehensive sense, all sin. This was the great object of Christ's manifestation, the annulling of sin, its total destruction, the counteraction of all its effects. This was to be accomplished **διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ** "through His sacrifice," the simple subjective genitive. The sentence draws attention not to the nature of the sacrifice, but to its three characteristics, that it was made once for tall, in the consummation, for sin's abolition.

Ver. 27. **καὶ καθ' ὅσον . . .** "And inasmuch as it is reserved for men once to die and, after this, judgment, so, also, Christ, etc." To confirm his statement that Christ's sacrifice was "once for all," he appeals to the normal conditions of human death. To men generally, **τοῖς ἀνθρώποις,** it is appointed once to die, men are not permitted to return to earth to compensate for neglect or failure, but immediately succeeding upon death, if not in time, yet in consequence, follows judgment. The results of life are entered upon. So Christ died but once and the results will be apparent in His appearing the second time without sin unto salvation. **ἀπόκειται** "is reserved" as in Longinus' *De Subl.* ix. 7, **ἡμῖν δυσδαιμονοῦσιν ἀπόκειται λιμὴν κακῶν ὁ θάνατος,** *cf.* iii. 5; also Dion. Hal. v. 8, **ὅσα τοῖς κακούργοις ἀπόκειται παθεῖν,** and especially 2 Tim. iv. 8. What is destined for all men is not simply death, but **ἅπαξ ἀποθ.** once to die. *Cf.* the fragment of Sophocles **θανεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔξεστι τοῖς αὐτοῖσι δίς. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις** "after this," but how long, the author does not say. "Man dies once, and the next thing before him is judgment. So Christ died once and the next thing before Him is the Advent" (Vaughan).

Ver. 28. **οὕτως.** The comparison extends to both terms, the once dying and the judgment. [*Cf.* Kübel, "die Korrespondenz ist nicht bloss die der gleichen Menschennatur, sondern das, dass mit dem Tod das, was das Leben bedeutet, abgeschlossen, fertig ist"]. The results of the life are settled. And in Christ's case the result is that He appears the second time without sin unto salvation, the sin having been destroyed by His death. **ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς** corresponds to **ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν** of ver. 27. The passive is used to be more in keeping with the universal *law* expressed in **ἀπόκειται** of ver. 27. Though the "offering" as we have seen includes both the death and the entrance into the Holiest with the blood, it is the death which is here prominent. **εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας,** "to bear the sins of many". Westcott

X. 1. [a]ΣΚΙΑΝ γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ a viii. 5, et ix. 9; Col. ii. 17.
αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις [1] ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς, οὐδέποτε δύναται [2] τοὺς προσερχο-

[1] ℵP add αυτων.

[2] T.R. in D*, etc., EHKL, d, e, f, vg., Basm., Copt.; δυνανται in ℵACDbP.

says, "the burden which Christ took upon Him and bore to the cross was 'the sins of many' not, primarily, or separately from the sins, the punishment of sins." But in what intelligible sense can sins be borne but by bearing their punishment? In Numbers xiv. 33, *e.g.*, it is said "your sins shall be fed in the wilderness forty years **καὶ ἀνοίσουσι τὴν πορνείαν ὑμῶν,** where the same verb is used as here to express the idea of suffering punishment for the sins of others. **πολλῶν,** although it was the death of but one, *cf.* Rom. v. 12-21, but probably only a reminiscence of Isa. lviii. 12. **αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε. ἐκ δευτέρου . . .** a second time He shall appear, **ὀφθήσεται,** visible to the eye. The word is probably used because appropriate to the appearances after the resurrection, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 34, Acts ix. 17, xiii. 31, 1 Cor. 5, 6, 7, 8 where **ὤφθη** is regularly used. But on this "second" appearance His object is different. He will come not **εἰς τὸ πολ. ἀνεν. ἁμαρτίας,** but **χωρὶς ἁμ. εἰς σωτηρίαν** irrespective of sin, not to be a sin offering but to make those who wait for Him partakers of the great salvation, ii. 3, *cf.* x. 37-39; and ix. 12. **τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις** "There may be an illusion to the reappearance of the High Priest after the solemn ceremonial in the Holy of Holies on the day of atonement to the anxiously waiting people" (Vaughan). *Cf.* Luke i. 21. The word is used in 1 Cor. i. 7 and Phil. iii. 20 of the expectation of the second advent, and in 2 Tim. iv. 8 is varied by the beautiful expression "they that have loved His appearing".

CHAPTER X.—Vv. 1-18. *Finality of Christ's one sacrifice.* The law merely presents a shadow of the essential spiritual blessings and does not perfect those who seek God through it. Its sacrifices therefore must be continually repeated and the consciousness of sins is annually revived, for animal blood cannot take sins away. Accordingly, when Christ comes into the world He says, "Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldst not, I am come to do Thy will". He proclaims the uselessness of O.T. sacrifices, that He may clear the ground for "the offering of the body of Christ". This is the great distinction between Christ and all other priests. They stand daily ministering, He by one offering has perfected those who approach God through Him.

Vv. 1-4. The sacrifices of the law inadequate.

Ver. 1. **Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων . . .** The **γὰρ** intimates that we have here a further explanation of the finality of Christ's one sacrifice (ix. 28) and therefore of its superiority to the sacrifices of the law. The explanation consists in this that the law had only "a shadow of the good things that were to be, not the very image of the things". **Σκιὰν** is in the emphatic place, as that characteristic of the law which determines its inadequacy. "A shadow" suggests indefiniteness and unsubstantiality; a mere indication that a reality exists. **εἰκών** suggests what is in itself substantial and also gives a true representation of that which it images. "The **εἰκών** brings before us under the conditions of space, as we can understand it, that which is spiritual" (Westcott). So Kübel, etc. The contrast is between a bare intimation that good things were to be given, and an actual presentation of these good things in an apprehensible form. It is *implied* that this latter is given in Christ; but what is asserted is, that the law did not present the coming realities in a form which brought them within the comprehension of the people. [Bleek cites from Cicero, *De Off.*, iii. 17, 69, "nos veri juris germanaeque justitiae solidam et expressam effigiem nullam tenemus, umbra et imaginibus utimur".]

That the law possessed no more than a shadow of the coming good was exhibited in its constantly renewed sacrifices. **κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν** belongs to **ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις,** "with the same annually repeated sacrifices," further explained and emphasised by the relative clause, **ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς,** "which they perpetually offer". **οὐδέποτε δύναται . . .** the law can never with these perpetually renewed offerings perfect the worshippers". "No repetition of the shadow can amount to the substance" (Davidson). The proof is given in the following words, ver. 2: **ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύ-**

μένους τελειῶσαι. 2. ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι, διὰ
τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας, ἅπαξ
b ix. 13; Lev. xvi. 14; Num. xix. 4. κεκαθαρμένους[1]· 3. ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ'
ἐνιαυτόν· 4. [b]ἀδύνατον γὰρ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων ἀφαιρεῖν
c Ps. xl. 6, 7, et l. 8, etc.; Esa. i. 11; Jer. vi. 20; Amos v. 21. ἁμαρτίας. 5. [c]Διὸ εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον λέγει, "Θυσίαν καὶ
προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι· 6. ὁλοκαυτώματα
καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας[2]· 7. τότε εἶπον, Ἰδοὺ ἥκω· ἐν
κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ· τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεός, τὸ

[1] κεκαθαρισμενους ℵDEHKP, 17, 37, 71.
[2] ηυδοκησας in ACD*HP, 37, 73.

σαντο προσφερόμεναι. The constant renewal of the yearly round of sacrifices proves that they were inefficacious, for had the worshippers once been cleansed they would have had no longer any consciousness of sins and would therefore have sought no renewal of sacrifice. **ἐπεὶ,** "since," if the O.T. sacrifices had perfected those who used them. **προσφερόμεναι** corresponding to **προσφέρουσιν,** and **τοὺς λατρεύοντας** to **τοὺς προσερχομένους** of previous verse. **ἅπαξ κεκαθ.,** that is, once delivered from a sense of guilt, *cf.* ix. 14, where **συνείδησις** is also used in same sense as here, the consciousness of sin as barring approach to God. The sinner once cleansed may, no doubt, be again defiled and experience a renewed consciousness of guilt. But in the writer's view this consciousness is at once absorbed in the consciousness of his original cleansing. *Cf.* John xiii. 10. **ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς. . . .** So far from these O.T. sacrifices once for all cleansing the conscience and thus perfecting the worshippers, "by and in them there is a yearly remembrance of sins," that is, of sins not yet sufficiently atoned for by any past sacrifice. *Cf.* Num. v. 15. **θυσία μνημοσύνου ἀναμιμνήσκουσα ἁμαρτίαν,** and Philo, *De Plantat.*, 25, **αἱ θυσίαι ὑπομιμνήσκουσαι τὰς ἑκάστων ἀγνοίας, κ.τ.λ.** This remembrance of sins is **κατ' ἐνιαυτόν,** which is most naturally referred to the annual confession of the whole people on the day of Atonement. The remembrance was not of sins previously atoned for but of sins committed since the previous sacrifice; there was no perception that any previous atonement was sufficient for all sin. The underlying ground of this inadequacy being expressed in ver. 4. **ἀδύνατον γὰρ. . . .** "For it is impossible that the blood of oxen and goats should take away sins". This obvious truth needs no proof. There is no relation between the physical blood of animals and man's moral offence. *Cf.* the *Choephori* of Æschylus, 70, "all waters, joining together to cleanse from blood the polluted hand, may strive in vain". **ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας,** "to take away sins," in the sense of removing their guilt as in Num. xiv. 18, Lev. x. 17, Rom. xi. 27.

Vv. 5-10. The adequacy of Christ's sacrifice as fulfilling God's will. **διὸ** "wherefore," "such being the ineffectiveness of the sacrifices of the law and the condition of conscience of those under them," "when He—that is **ὁ Χριστός** ix. 28 to whom alone **εἰσερχόμ.** is applicable—comes into the world," referring generally to His incarnate state, not to His entrance on his public ministry. **λέγει,** the words are quoted from Ps. xl. 6-8 and put in the mouth of Christ although the whole Psalm cannot be considered Messianic, *cf.* ver. 12. In what sense can **λέγει** be used of Christ? It is not meant that He was present in the psalmist and so uttered what is here here referred to Him. This idea is negatived by **εἰσερχόμ.** It was when incarnate he used the words. Neither is it merely meant that by his conduct Christ showed that these words were a true expression of his mind. Rather, the words are considered prophetic, depicting beforehand the mind of Christ regarding O.T. sacrifice, and His own mission. In several O.T. passages God's preference for obedience is affirmed (1 Sam. xv. 22, Ps. l. 8, Micah, Isa. i. 11, Hosea, vi. 6) but this psalm is here selected because the phrase "a body hast thou prepared for me" lends itself to the writer's purpose. In the Psalm, indeed, sacrifice is contrasted with obedience to the will of God. A body is prepared for Christ that in it He may obey God. But it is the offering of this body as a sacrifice in contrast to the animal sacrifices of the law, which this writer emphasises (ver. 10). "The con-

θέλημά σου". 8. Ἀνώτερον λέγων, "Ὅτι θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν[1] καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἠθέλησας οὐδὲ εὐδόκησας"·

[1] θυσιας και προσφορας in ℵ*ACD*P, 17, 23, d, e, f, vg., Sah., Copt.; T.R. in ℵcDcEKL, Aeth.

trast is between animal offerings and the offering of Himself by the Son. And what is said is that God did not will the former, but willed the other, and that the former are thereby abolished, and the other is established in their room, and as the will of God is effectual. The passage in the epistle is far from saying that the essence or worth of Christ's offering of Himself lies simply in obedience to the will of God. It does not refer to the point wherein lies the intrinsic worth of the Son's offering, or whether it may be resolved into obedience unto God. Its point is quite different. It argues that the Son's offering of Himself is the true and final offering for sin, because it is the sacrifice, which, according to prophecy, God desired to be made" (Davidson).

The writer, in citing Ps. 40, follows the LXX, slightly altering the construction of the last clause by omitting ἠβουλήθην, and thus making τοῦ ποιῆσαι depend upon ἥκω, "I am come to do thy will". *Cf.* ver. 9.

θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν representing זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה of the Psalm, animal sacrifice and meal offering. *Cf.* Ephes. v. 2. οὐκ ἠθέλησας "thou didst not will," a contrast is intended between this clause and τὸ θέλημά σου of the last clause of ver. 7. σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι "but a body didst Thou prepare for me," implying that in this body God's will would be accomplished. *Cf.* ver. 10. The words are the LXX rendering of אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי, "ears didst Thou dig [or open] for me". The meaning is the same. The opened ear as the medium through which the will of God was received, and the body by which it was accomplished, alike signify obedience to the will of God. ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας representing עוֹלָה וַחֲטָאָה of the psalm, whole burnt offering and sin-offering. περὶ ἁμαρτ. occurs frequently in Leviticus to denote sin offering, θυσία being omitted. οὐκ ηὐδόκησας "thou didst not take pleasure in". τότε εἶπον. "Then," that is, when it was apparent that not by animal sacrifices or material offerings could God be propitiated, "I said, Lo! I am come to do Thy will, O God," to accomplish that purpose of Thine which the sacrifices of the O.T. could not accomplish. That this is the correct construction is shown by ver. 9. For construction, *cf.* Burton, *M. and T.*, 397; and Prof. Votaw, *Use of Infin. in N. T.* ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ "in a book [lit. in a roll of a book] it has been written concerning me". κεφαλίς denoting "a little head" was first applied to the end of the stick on which the parchment was rolled, and from which in artistically finished books two *cornua* proceeded. [See Bleek, Rich's *Dict. of Antiq.*, and Hatch's *Concordance*] In the Psalm the phrase is joined with the previous words and might be read, "Lo! I am come, with a roll of a book written for me," in other words, with written instructions regarding the divine will as affecting me. The words can hardly mean that in Scripture predictions have been recorded regarding the writer of the Psalm. This, however, may be the meaning attached to the words as cited in the epistle, although it is quite as natural and legitimate to retain the original meaning and understand the words as a parenthetical explanation that Christ acknowledged as binding *on Him* all that had been written for the instruction of others in the will of God. But the likelihood is that if the writer was not merely transcribing the words as part of his quotation without attaching a definite meaning to them, he meant that the coming of the Messiah to do God's will had been written in the book of God's purpose. (*Cf.* Ps lvi. 9.)

Ver. 8. The significance of the quotation is now explained. "He takes the first away, that he may establish the second." He declares the incompetence of the O.T. sacrifices to satisfy the will of God, in order that he may make room for that sacrifice which is permanently to satisfy God. Ἀνώτερον, "Higher up," here meaning "in the former part of the quotation," corresponding to and contrasted with τότε in ver. 9. λέγων, *i.e.*, Christ, the subject of εἴρηκεν and ἀναιρεῖ. This is necessitated by λέγει in ver. 3. Yet it is not Christ directly, but the mind of Christ uttered by God in Scripture. εἴρηκεν, perfect, as expressing that which

αἵτινες κατὰ τὸν νόμον προσφέρονται· 9. τότε εἴρηκεν, "Ἰδοὺ ἥκω
τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεὸς,[1] τὸ θέλημά σου". ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ
d ix. 12. δεύτερον στήσῃ· 10. [d] ἐν ᾧ θελήματι ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμὲν οἱ[2] διὰ
τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ. 11. Καὶ
πᾶς μὲν ἱερεὺς[3] ἕστηκε καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν, καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πολ-
λάκις προσφέρων θυσίας, αἵτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται περιελεῖν ἁμαρ-

[1] ο θεος omitted in ℵ*ACDEKP, 17, d, e, Sah., Copt.
[2] οι omitted in ℵACD*E*P, 17, 47, 73.
[3] T.R. in ℵDEKL, 17, 47, d, e, f, vg.; αρχιερευς in ACP, Syrsch et p, Basm., Arm.

permanently fulfils the will of God. ἀναιρεῖν is used in classic Greek of the destruction or abolition or repeal of laws, governments, customs, etc.

Ver. 10. ἐν ᾧ θελήματι . . . "in which will," that is, in the will which Christ came to do (ver. 9), "we have been made fit for God's presence and fellowship by means of the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all". The will of God which the O.T. sacrifices could not accomplish was the "sanctification" of men, that is, the bringing of men into true fellowship with God. This will has been accomplished, we have been cleansed and introduced into God's fellowship through the offering of the body of Christ. By the use of the word προσφορᾶς the writer shows that it was not a mere general obedience to the will of God he had in view, but the fulfilment of God's will in the particular form of yielding Himself to a sacrificial death. His obedience in order to become an atoning sacrifice took a particular form, the form of "tasting death for every man". [For a different view see Bruce *in loc.* and Gould's *N.T. Theol.*, p. 169. On the other hand see Riehm and Macdonell's *Donellan Lectures*, p. 49-59.] τοῦ σώματος Ἰ. Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ, the offering of the body must of course be taken in connection with ix. 14, διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου and also with the defining words Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἐφάπαξ is added in contrast to the note of inferiority attaching to the O.T. sacrifices, as given in ver. 1, their need of continual renewal.

Vv. 11-14. That Christ's one sacrifice has accomplished its end of bringing men to God is illustrated by His sitting down at God's right hand.

Ver. 11. καὶ introduces a new aspect of the finality of Christ's sacrifice, to wit, that "whereas every priest stands daily ministering and often offering the same sacrifices,—inasmuch as they are such as never can take sins away—this man having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever sat down on God's right hand, henceforth waiting till his enemies be set as a footstool for his feet. For by one offering He hath perfected for ever the sanctified." The argument is in this statement advanced a step. For although the three points urged in vv. 1-4 are here still in view, *viz.*, that "the Levitical service consists of repeated acts (καθ' ἡμέραν, κατ' ἐνιαυτόν) and these the same (αἱ αὐταὶ θυσίαι) and essentially ineffective (οὐδέποτε δύνανται, κ.τ.λ), yet it is now the action of the priest rather than the nature of the sacrifice that comes to the front, and the finality of Christ's offering is argued from the historical fact that He was not any longer standing ministering but had sat down as one who had quite finished His work. Therefore in ver. 14 τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους takes the place of ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμὲν of ver. 10. Nothing further requires to be done to secure in perpetuity the fellowship of man with God. In the one sacrifice of Christ there is cleansing which fits men to draw near to God, to enter into covenant with Him, and there is also ground laid for their continuance in that fellowship. The future (εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς) is provided for as well as the past. Limborch quoted by Bleek says "perficit, *i.e.*, perfecte et plene a peccatorum reatu liberavit, ita ut in perpetuum sanctificati sint et ulteriore aut nova oblatione non indigeant". "His one offering gathers up into itself both the sacrifice that inaugurates the covenant, and all the many sacrifices offered year by year to maintain it and to realise it; it reaches the idea which they strove towards in vain, and by reaching it for ever sets them aside" (Davidson).

In ver. 11 the more expressive περιελεῖν replaces ἀφαιρεῖν of ver. 4. It means "to take away something that is all

τίας· 12. [e] αὐτὸς[1] δὲ μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν εἰς e i. 3, 13, et viii. 1;
τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 13. τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος Ps. cx. 1; Acts ii.
ἕως τεθῶσιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. 14. μιᾷ 34; 1 Cor.
γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους. 15. xv. 25; Eph. i.
Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ προειρη- 20; Col.
κέναι,[2] 16. "[f] Αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἣν διαθήσομαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ τὰς f viii. 8;
ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει Κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν, ver. xxxi. 31, etc.;
καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν διανοιῶν[3] αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· 17. καὶ τῶν ἁμαρ- Rom. xi. 27.
τιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ[4] ἔτι". 18. Ὅπου g ix. 8, 12; Joan. x.
δὲ ἄφεσις τούτων, οὐκ ἔτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας. 9, et xiv. 6; Rom.

19. [g] Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων v. 2; Eph. ii. 13, 18,
ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, 20. ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ et iii. 12.

[1] ουτος in ℵACD*EP, d, e, f, vg.
[2] ειρηκεναι in ℵACDEP, it, vg.
[3] επι την διανοιαν in ℵACDgr*P, 17, 47, 73.
[4] μνησθησομαι in ℵ*ACD*, 17.

round" as **δέρματα σωμάτων**, a garment, the covering of a letter. In Gen. xli. 42 it is used of Pharaoh taking off his ring. The phrase therefore suggests that man is enwrapped in sin; or if this is to press too hard the etymological meaning, it at least suggests *complete* deliverance. **οὗτος** *cf.* iii. 3 and viii. 3. **εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς** cannot be construed with **προσενέγκας** but must be taken with **ἐκάθισεν**. "To say of the Levitical priests that they **προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς** (ver. 1) is appropriate; to say of Christ that He **προσήνεγκεν εἰς τὸ διην.** is almost a self-contradiction" (Vaughan). **εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν** balances **ἕστηκεν καθ' ἡμέραν**, and *cf.* especially i. 3. No doubt the usual position of **εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς** is after the word it qualifies, x. 1-14 and vii. 3. **τοὺς ἁγιαζ.** has no time reference, *cf.* ii. 11.

Vv. 15-18. Proof from Scripture that the one sacrifice of Christ, the mediator of the new covenant is final.

Ver. 15. **μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν . . .** "And the Holy Spirit also bears witness to us," that is, that the one offering of the Son is final, for under the new covenant there is no further remembrance of sins. **ἡμῖν** is more naturally construed as a dativus commodi than as the object of **μαρτυρεῖ**. **μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι.** "For after saying . . ." we expect the apodosis to begin and the sentence to be concluded by an introductory **ἔπειτα λέγει** or **τότε** (*cf.* ver. 9), but ver. 17 is not so introduced. The sense, however, is unmistakable. After defining the covenant in its inwardness and spirituality (*v.* c. viii. 10), the writer introduces that feature of it which specially serves his present purpose **καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν . . . οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι ἔτι**, "And I will never any more remember their sins and their transgressions". The conclusion is obvious, "But where there is remission of these, there is no longer offering for sin". For the terms of the new covenant see viii. 8-12. **μνησθήσομαι** is here used instead of **μνησθῶ** of LXX and of viii. 12, because the writer emphasises the extens on of the forgetting to all futurity.

CHAPS. X. 19—XII. 29. Exhortation to use the access to God opened by Christ and to maintain faith in Him in spite of all temptation to fall away.

CHAP. X. 19-25. Exhortation to draw near to God, to hold fast the Christian hope, and to encourage one another.

Ver. 19. **Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί. . . .** "Having then, brethren, confidence for the entrance into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, a way which He inaugurated for us fresh and living, through the veil, that is, His flesh." For the form of the sentence *cf.* iv. 14. **παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον**, *cf.* iii. 6 and iv. 16 **προσερχώμεθα μετὰ παρρησίας**, also Eph. iii. 12. **ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὴν προσαγωγήν.** **εἴσοδος** may either mean an entrance objectively considered, or the act of entering. Weiss adopts the former meaning, compelled as he supposes by the **ὁδὸν** which follows in apposition and referring to Jud. i. 24 and Ezek. xxvii. 3. He would therefore

h iv. 14, 16. ζῶσαν, διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τουτέστι, τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, 21. i Ezech. xxxvi. 25; [h] καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, 22. [i] προσερχώμεθα Eph. ii. 12; Jac. i. 6. μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως, ἐρραντισμένοι τὰς

translate "boldness as regards the entrance". The objection to this interpretation is the meaning put upon **εἰς** which more naturally expresses the object or end towards which the **παρρησία** is directed, the entering in, not merely the object *about which* the **παρρησία** is exercised. *Cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 10, **μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν.** But *cf.* Winer on **εἰς.** The expression in ix. 8, **τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν,** also favours Weiss's interpretation. **τῶν ἁγίων** as the Greek commentators remark, here means "heaven". **ἐν τ. αἵματι Ἰησοῦ,** on the whole, it is better to join these words not with **παρρησίαν** but with **εἴσοδον.** Bleek sees a reference to ix. 25, **ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ. ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν . . .** "The new and living way which He inaugurated [or dedicated] for us." The antecedent of the clause is **εἴσοδον,** and this way into the holiest is here further described as first used by Christ that it might be used by us. For **ἐγκαινίζειν** means to handsel, to take the first use of a new thing. See Deut. xx. 5. He has entered within the veil as our **πρόδρομος** (vi. 19, 20) and has thus opened a way for us. It is **πρόσφατον,** recent, fresh. The lexicographers are agreed that, originally meaning fresh-slain and applied to **νεκρός, πρόσφατος** came to be used of flowers, oil, snow, misfortune, benefits, in *Sirac.* ix. 10, of a friend; in Eccles. i. 9 **οὐκ ἔστι πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον.** It was a way recently opened. Christ was the first who trod that way. Wetstein, who gives many examples of the use of the word, cites also from *Florus*, i. 15, 3, an interesting analogy: "Alter [Decius Mus] quasi monitu deorum, capite velato, primam ante aciem diis manibus se devoverit, ut in confertissima se hostium tela jaculatus, novum ad victoriam iter sanguinis sui semita aperiret". **καὶ ζῶσαν,** not as a way that abides (Chrys., etc.) nor as leading to life eternal (Grotius, etc.), nor as a way which consists in fellowship with a Person (Westcott), but as effective, actually bringing its followers to their goal. *Cf.* iv. 12. So Davidson and Weiss. **διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος,** a further characteristic of the way, it passed through the veil, that is, His flesh, which must first be rent before Christ could pass into the holiest. "This beautiful allegorizing of the veil cannot, of course, be made part of a consistent and complete typology. It is not meant for this. But as the veil stood locally before the holiest in the Mosaic Tabernacle, the way into which lay through it, so Christ's life in the flesh stood between Him and His entrance before God, and His flesh had to be rent ere He could enter" (Davidson).

Ver. 21. **καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν.** The opened way into the holiest is not the only advantage possessed by the Christian, he has also "a great priest," *cf.* iv. 14 **ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν . . . προσερχώμεθα.** Philo (*Leg. ad Gai.*, p. 1035) calls the High Priest **ὁ μέγας ἱερεύς,** and so Lev. xxi. 10, Num. xxxv. 25. But it is not to the fact that He is High Priest that this designation here points, but to His greatness as Son of God and as one who has passed into the Holy Presence. Especially is His greatness manifested in His administration **ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ,** over God's house (*cf.* iii. 6) that is, over those heavenly realities which replace the house of God on earth, and necessarily over those for whom the priest is appointed to minister **τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν** (v. 1).

Ver. 22. Being thus secure of an acceptable entrance **προσερχώμεθα,** "let us keep approaching," that is, to God (vii. 25, xi. 6); a semi-technical term. **μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας,** "with a true heart" (*cf.* Isa. xxxviii. 3), not with a merely bodily approach as if all were external and symbolic, but with that genuine engagement of the inner man which constitutes true worship. Chrysostom has **χωρὶς ὑποκρίσεως.** Davidson has "with fundamental genuineness"; but it is the genuineness which is elicited in presence of realities. **καρδία** is interpreted in 1 Pet. iii. 4, **ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος.** It is the inevitable qualification of one who comes **ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως,** "in full assurance of faith," believing not only that God is (xi. 6) but that a way to His favour and fellowship is opened by the Great Priest. To engender this full assurance has been the aim of the writer throughout the Epistle. **ῥεραντισμένοι . . . λελουσμένοι.** These participles express not conditions of approach to God which are yet to be achieved, but con-

καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς· 23. [k] καὶ λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ, κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆ· πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος· 24. καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων, 25. [l] μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυν-

k iv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 9; 1 Thess. v. 24.

l Rom. xiii. 11; 2 Peter iii. 9, 11, 14.

ditions already possessed, "our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our body washed with pure water". Both participles must be construed with **προσερχώμεθα.** The obvious connection of "heart" and "body" forbids the attachment of **λελουσμένοι** to **κατέχωμεν.** To connect both participles with **κατεχ.** is equally impossible. "**προσέρχεσθαι** is a technical liturgical word, and sprinkling and washing are liturgical acts of preparation" (Delitzsch). Possibly the mention of sprinkling and washing is an echo of the injunctions of Exod. xxix. 4, 21, xxx. 20, xl. 30, prescribing similar preparation for the priestly functions. Our heart or inner man by the application of the **αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ** (*cf.* 1 Pet. i. 2) is delivered from the consciousness of guilt (ix. 14); our body by the application of the purifying water of baptism becomes the symbol of complete purity. "Sprinkled with that blood which speaketh evermore in the heavenly sanctuary, and washed with baptismal water sacramentally impregnated with the same, we are at all times privileged to approach by a new and living way the heavenly temple, entering by faith its inner sanctuary, and there presenting ourselves in the presence of God" (Delitzsch). *Cf.* especially Ps. li. 6-7, and Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, c. 80 (p. 383) where ceremonial purifications are explained on the principle that the Pure and Undefiled must be worshipped by the pure in body and soul.

Ver. 23. A second branch of the exhortation is given in the words **κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν . . .** "Let us hold fast and unbending the confession of our hope," as in iii. 6. *Cf.* also vi. 11. For as yet in this life the fulness of blessing which comes of fellowship with God is not experienced, the perfected salvation and the heavenly country (xii. 22-23) are yet to be reached. But these are the contents of the Christian hope, and this hope is confessed and maintained in presence of a commonplace, scoffing and alluring world. It is to be maintained for the best of all reasons: **πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος.** The promises of God are necessarily the ground of hope, *v.* vi. 12. These promises cannot fail, because God cannot lie, vi. 18.

Ver. 24. To the exhortation to faith and hope he adds an exhortation to love: **καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους,** "and let us consider one another," taking into account and weighing our neighbour's circumstances and especially his risks, but this with a view not to exasperating criticism but **εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης,** "with a view to incite them to love and good works," acknowledging honest endeavour and making allowance for imperfection. **παροξυσμός** is "stimulation" either to good or evil. In Acts xv. 39 it is used of angry irritation, as in LXX, Deut. xxix. 28, Jer. xxxix. 37. So in medical writers of a *paroxysm.* But frequently in classics the verb is used of stimulating to good as in Plato, *Epist.* iv. p. 321 and in Xen. *Cyrop.* 6, 2, 5, **τούτους ἐπαινῶν παρώξυνε.** Isocrates, *ad Demon.*, etc. The writer, in vi. 9-10, has set his readers a good example of this considerate incitement. In order to fulfil his injunction they must not neglect meeting together for Christian worship and encouragement **μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν.** Delitzsch suggests that the compound word is used instead of the simple **συναγωγή** in order to avoid a word with Judaic associations; but **συναγωγή** might rather have suggested the building and formal stated meetings, while **ἐπισυν. ἑαυτῶν** denotes merely the meeting together of Christians. That these meetings were for mutual edification is shown by the **ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες.** Some made a practice of neglecting these meetings, whether from fear of persecution or from scorn or from business engagements. *Cf.* Jude, 18-20, and Moberly's *Minist. Priesthood*, p. 14. This good custom of meeting together and mutually exhorting one another was to be all the more punctually and zealously attended to, **ὅσῳ βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν,** "in proportion as ye see the day drawing near". "The day" is of course the day of the Lord's return (ix. 28), the day of days. The Epistle being written in all probability a year or two before the destruction of Jerusalem, the signs of the coming day which could be "seen" were probably the restlessness, forebodings of coming disaster, and initial collisions with

m vi. 4; Num. xv. 30; Matt. xii. 31; 2 Peter ii. 20, 21; 1 Joan v. 16.
n Ezech. xxxvi. 5; Sophon i. 18, et iii. 8.
o Num. xxxv. 30; Deut. xvii. 6, et xix. 15; Matt. xviii. 16; Joan. viii. 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 1.

ἀγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισίν, ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες· καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὅσῳ βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν. 26. [m] Ἑκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκ ἔτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία· 27. [n] φοβερὰ δέ τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως, καὶ πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους. 28. [o] ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωσέως, χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν ἐπὶ δυσὶν

the Romans which heralded the great war.

Vv. 26-39. Dreadful result of falling from faith.

Ver. 26. **Ἑκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν. . . .** "For if we go on sinning wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no more remains a sacrifice for sins, but a certain dreadful waiting for judgment and a fury of fire which is to devour the adversaries." **γὰρ,** introducing an additional reason for the preceding exhortation. The emphasis is on **ἑκουσίως**; and the present tense of **ἁμαρτ.** must not be overlooked. *Cf.* **τῶν ἀκουσίων ἁμαρτημάτων καταφυγὴν εἶναι τοὺς βωμούς,** Thuc. iv. 98. Wilful sin, continued in, means apostasy, repudiation of the covenant. *Cf.* vi. 6, **καὶ παραπεσόντας,** and v. 2, **τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν,** and iii. 12. Apostasy can only occur **μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν . . .** a condition which is explained in detail in chap. 6. Without this preceding knowledge of the covenant its wilful repudiation is impossible. Those spoken of in ver. 25, as having abandoned meeting with their fellow Christians, and possibly as having neglected, if not renounced, the confession of their hope, were perhaps alluded to here, as on their way to apostasy. They are warned that they are drifting into an irredeemable condition, for to those who have repudiated and keep repudiating the one sacrifice of Christ, **οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτίων ἀπολείπεται θυσία.** The only sacrifice has been rejected, and there is no other sacrifice which can atone for the rejection of this sacrifice. "The meaning is not merely that the Jewish sacrifices to which the apostate has returned have in themselves no sin-destroying power, nor even that there is no second sacrifice additional to that of Christ, but further that for a sinner of this kind the very sacrifice of Christ itself has no more atoning or reconciling power" (Delitzsch). That this is the meaning is shown by the positive assertion of what the future does contain, a terrifying prospect of waiting for inevitable judgment. The expression is not equivalent to **φοβερᾶς ἐκδοχῆ κρίσεως,** which, as Bleek remarks, would not be so impressive. **φοβερός** means either "causing fear" or "feeling fear"; "scaring" or "affrighted". Here it is used in the former sense. **ἐκδοχὴ** occurs elsewhere only in the sense of receiving something or of the acceptation or interpretation of a word; but ver. 13 and ix. 28 guide to the meaning given by the Vulg. *expectatis*. The **τις** by leaving the expectation indefinite heightens the terror of it. The imagination is allowed scope. **κρίσεως** is general, but immediately suggests **πυρὸς ζῆλος μέλλοντος,** the destined fire; for which see 2 Thess. i. 8-10. "Fiery indignation" very well renders **πυρὸς ζῆλος,** an anger which expresses itself in fire. The expression is derived from such O.T. phrases as Ps. lxxix. 5 **ἐκκαυθήσεται ὡς πῦρ ὁ ζῆλός σου.** *Cf.* Zeph. i. 18 and Deut. iv. 21. This fiery anger is destined to devour the adversaries; as in Isa. xxvi. 11 **ζῆλος λήψεται λαὸν ἀπαίδευτον, καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται,** and lxiv. 2 **κατακαύσει πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους.** *Cf.* also Isa. xxx. 27 **ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θυμοῦ ὡς πῦρ ἔδεται,** a natural figure used by Homer and others. **ὑπεναντίους,** see Lightfoot on Col. ii. 14, who shows that it means "direct, close, persistent opposition".

Ver. 28. **ἀθετήσας τις νόμον. . . .** "Any one who has set aside Moses' law dies without mercy on the evidence of two or three witnesses," in accordance with the law laid down in Deut. xvii. 6 regarding apostasy; although capital punishment was not restricted to this sin. For **ἀθετεῖν** *cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 8; and Isa. xxiv. 16, **οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν, οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον,** also Ezek. xxii. 26. **ἀθέτησις** is used absolutely in 1 Sam. xxiv. 12. **ἐπὶ . . . μάρτυσιν,** *cf.* ix. 17; **ἀποθνήσκει,** perhaps the tense does not carry with it the inference that the law was still being enforced. It may only mean "he dies" according to the law as it stands. **χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν,** to emphasise the inexorableness of the

ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν ἀποθνήσκει· 29. [p]πόσῳ δοκεῖτε χείρονος ἀξιωθή- p 1 Cor. xi. 29.
σεται τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς
διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος
ἐνυβρίσας; 30. [q]οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα, "Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ q Deut. xxxii. 35, 36; Rom. xii. 19.
ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος"· καὶ πάλιν, "Κύριος κρινεῖ τὸν λαὸν
αὐτοῦ". 31. Φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας Θεοῦ ζῶντος. 32. r Gal. iii. 4; Phil. i. 29, 30; Col. ii. 1.
[r]Ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες πολλὴν

law and the inevitable character of the doom. *Cf.* Josephus, c. *Apion*, ii. 30, **ὁ νόμος ἀπαραίτητος** and Ignatius, *ad Eph.* c. 16.

Ver. 29. **πόσῳ δοκεῖτε χείρονος. . . .** "Of how much sorer punishment, think ye, will he be counted worthy, who, etc." The argument of ii. 1-4 and xii. 25. By the parenthetically interjected **δοκεῖτε** he appeals to their own sense of proportion and fitness; although the judgment alluded to in **ἀξιωθήσεται** is not theirs but God's. **ὁ . . . καταπατήσας . . .** The guilt of the apostate which justifies this sorer punishment is detailed in three particulars. He has trampled on the Son of God. The highest of Beings who has deserved best at his hands is spurned with outrageous scorn. **καὶ τὸ αἷμα . . . ἡγιάσθη** "and has reckoned the blood of the covenant with which he was sanctified, a common thing": "The blood of the covenant" is the blood of Christ (*cf.* ix. 15 ff., xiii. 20); here it is thus designated because repudiation of the covenant is in question. This blood is the purifying agent by which men are fitted for the fellowship and service of God, and so brought within the covenant. *Cf.* **ἡγιάσθη** with **ἁγιάζει** of ix. 13 and **καθαριεῖ** of ix. 14. This sole means of purification, the sanctifying virtue of which the supposed apostate has experienced, he now counts **κοινὸν**, common or unclean. [The Vulg. has "pollutum," the Old Latin "communem". Chrysostom **ἀκάθαρτον ἢ τὸ μηδὲν πλέον ἔχον τῶν λοιπῶν**; and so Kübel, "which has no more worth than the blood of other men". All these meanings lie close to one another. *Cf.* Mark vii. 2, Acts x. 14. What is "common" is unsanctified, ceremonially unclean.] The third point in the heinousness of the sin of apostasy is **τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας**, "and has insulted the spirit of grace". This seems the direct antithesis to "Moses' law" of ver. 28. The spirit of grace is the distinctive gift of Christian times, and is not only the Pauline but the universal antithesis to the law. To have blasphemed this gracious Spirit, who brings the assurance of God's presence and pardon, and gifts suited to each believer, is to renounce all part in things spiritual. *Cf.* vi. 4, ii. 4; Eph. iv. 7.

Ver. 30. **οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα. . . .** "For we know Him who said, vengeance is mine, I will repay." The certainty of the punishment spoken of is based upon the righteousness of God. "We know who it is that said"; it is the living God (v. 31). The quotation is from Deut. xxxii. 35 not as in the LXX but as given in Rom. xii. 19 where it is used as an argument for the surrender of private vengeance. In Deut. LXX the words are **Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω.** The second quotation, **κρινεῖ κύριος . . .** is from the following verse where the words intimate God's protecting care of His people, using **κρινεῖ** in the sense common in O.T. Delitzsch thinks that sense may be retained here, but this is less relevant and consistent with the passage. *Cf.* Ecclus. xxvii. 28 **ἡ ἐκδίκησις ὡς λέων.** and xxviii. 1. **φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν. . . .** "It is dreadful to fall into the hands of the living God". Where David (2 Sam. xxiv. 14) prefers to do so [**ἐμπεσοῦμαι δὴ εἰς χεῖρας κυρίου**] it is because he knows his chastisement will be measured and that no unjust advantage will be taken. The dreadfulness of the impenitent's doom arises from the same certainty that absolute justice will be done. As Judge, God is "the living God," who sees and has power to execute just judgment, *cf.* iii. 12, xii. 22, *cf.* xii. 29.

Ver. 32. As in the parallel passage in chap. 6, the writer at ver. 9 suddenly turns from the presentation of the terrifying aspect of apostasy to make appeal to more generous motives, so here he now encourages them to perseverance by reminding them of their praiseworthy past. As Vaughan remarks, the thought is that of Gal. iii. 3. **ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας.**

ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων· 33. [s] τοῦτο μὲν, ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ
θλίψεσι θεατριζόμενοι· τοῦτο δὲ, κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφομένων
γενηθέντες· 34. [t] καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς[1] μου συνεπαθήσατε, καὶ τὴν
ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες
ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὕπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ μένουσαν. 35·
[u] μὴ ἀποβάλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἔχει μισθαποδοσίαν

s Phil. i. 7, et iv. 14. t Matt. v. 12, et vi. 20, et xix. 21; Luc. xii. 33; Acts v. 41, et xxi. 33; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 19; Jac. i. 2. u Matt. x. 32.

[1] T.R. in ℵDᶜEHKLP, d, e, Aeth.; δεσμιοις AD* f, vg., Syr^{utr}, Copt., Arm.

. . . "But recall the former days, in which after being enlightened ye endured much wrestling with sufferings". **ἀναμιμ,** "remind yourselves," as in 2 Cor. vii. 15. See Wetstein's examples, where the genitive not the accusative follows the verb, and M. Aurelius, v. 31. **τὰς πρότερον ἡμ.** [as in Thucyd., vi. 9 **ἐν τῷ πρότερον χρόνῳ.**] days separated from the present by some considerable interval, as is implied in v. 12. They are further described as **ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες** as in vi. 4; equivalent to "receiving the knowledge of the truth," ver. 26. It was the new light in Christ, shed upon their relation to God and on their prospects, which enabled them to endure much wrestling or conflict with sufferings. **ἄθλησις** in the next generation came to mean "martyrdom," as in *Mart. of S. Ignatius*, chap. 4. [For the genitive *cf.* "certamina divitiarum," Hor. *Epp.*, i. 5 8.] What these sufferings were is described in two clauses, they were partly in their own persons, partly in their sympathy and voluntary sharing in the suffering of others, **τοῦτο μὲν . . . θεατριζόμενοι, τοῦτο δὲ κοινωνοὶ . . .** For the distributive formula, "partly," . . . "partly," see abundant examples from the classics in Wetstein. See also Plutarch's *Them.*, v. 4. It may be rendered "as well by," "as by". **θεατριζόμενοι,** "made a spectacle," [**ὥσπερ ἐπὶ θεάτρου παραδειγματιζόμενοι,** Theophyl., *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 9], literally true of the Christians who were exposed to wild beasts in the amphitheatre. See Renan's *L'Antéchrist*, pp. 162 ff., "A la barbarie des supplices on ajouta la dérision". But here it was not by lions and leopards and wild bulls they were attacked, but **ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσιν,** "reproaches and distresses," "opprobriis et tribulationibus" (Vulg.). **ὀνειδισμός** is frequent in LXX, and several times in the phrase **λόγοι ὀνειδ.** In this Epistle it occurs again in xi. 26 and xiii. 13, and *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 14. Some who have not directly suffered persecution in these forms suffered by sympathy and by identifying themselves with those who were experiencing such usage, **τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφομένων.** *Cf.* Phil. iv. 14. Farrar renders well, "who lived in this condition of things". In what sense they became **κοινωνοί** is immediately explained; they sympathised with those who were imprisoned and welcomed the violent seizure of their possessions. **καὶ γὰρ,** as always, must here be rendered "For indeed," "for in point of fact," proving by more definite instances that they had become partakers with the persecuted. They had felt for the imprisoned, as was possibly alluded to in vi. 10, and as they are in xiii. 3 exhorted still to do. *Cf.* Mat. xxv. 36, which probably formed a large factor in the production of that care for the persecuted which characterised the early Church. They had also suffered the loss of their goods. **ἁρπαγὴν,** the violent and unjust seizure, as in Mat. xxiii. 25, Luke xi. 39. **ἁρπαγὴ ὑπαρχόντων** occurs in Lucian and Artemidorus. See Stephanus. That which enables them to take joyfully the loss of their possessions is their consciousness that they have a possession which is better and which cannot be taken away. **γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοὺς** [for **ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς**]. If the true reading is **ἑαυτοῖς** then the meaning is easy "knowing that you have for yourselves". If we read **ἑαυτοὺς,** this may mean, as Davidson, Westcott and others suppose, "knowing that you have yourselves a better possession". But this seems not very congruous with the writer's usual style. It is more likely that the writer uses the emphatic "you yourselves" in contrast to those who had robbed them and now possessed their goods. So von Soden. Or it may mean "ye yourselves" in contrast to the possession itself of which they have been deprived, ye yourselves however stripped of all earthly goods.

Ver. 35. **μὴ ἀποβάλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν . . .** "Cast not away, then, your

μεγάλην. 36. [v] ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρείαν, ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιήσαντες, κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. 37. [w] Ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, "ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει, καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ. 38. ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως[1] ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή

v Luc. xxi. 19.
w Hab. ii. 3, 4; Agg. ii. 6; Luc. xviii. 8; Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 11; 1 Peter i. 6, et v. 10; 2 Peter iii. 8.

[1] In B of LXX μου follows πιστεως, in A it follows δικαιος. B gives the more probable reading. In the text of Hebrews T.R. omits μου with DEH**KLP. μου is inserted after δικαιος in ℵAH*, f, vg., Arm., Clem., Thdrt. Cp. Rom. i. 17, Gal. iii. 11.

confidence, for it has great recompense of reward". The exhortation begun in ver. 19 is resumed, with now the added force springing from their remembrance of what they have already endured and from their consciousness of a great possession in heaven. A reason for holding fast their confidence is now found in the result of so doing. It has great reward. **μισθαποδοσία** used in ii. 2 of requital of sin, here and in xi. 26 of reward. *Cf.* Clem. *ad Cor.* 6, **γέρας γενναῖον**, and Wisdom iii. 5. Therefore, **μὴ ἀποβάλητε**, do not throw it away as a worthless thing you have no further need of. Retain it, **ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρείαν**, "for ye have need of endurance," of maintaining your hopeful confidence to the end under all circumstances. Without endurance the promise which secures to them the enduring possession cannot be enjoyed, for before entering upon its enjoyment, the whole will of God concerning them must be done and borne. **ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τ. θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν**, Davidson and Weiss agree in thinking that "the will of God is His will that they should hold fast their confidence". Rather, that accepting all privation, as they once did (ver. 32) and recognising all they were called to endure as God's will concerning them, they should thus endure to the end (*cf.* iii. 6) and so receive the promised good (**ἐπαγγελία** = the thing promised as in vi. 12, 15). **κομίσησθε**, the verb properly means to carry off or to recover what is one's own. See Mat. xxv. 27; 2 Cor. v. 10; Heb. xi. 13, 19, 39. And their entrance on the reward of their endurance will not long be delayed **ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον. . . .** "For yet a little—a very little—while and He that cometh will have come and will not delay." ["Es ist noch ein Kleines, wie sehr, wie sehr Klein" (Weiss), "noch eine kleine Zeit, ganz Klein" (Weizsäcker). "Adhuc enim modicum aliquantulum" (Vulg.). "For yet a little—ever so little—while" (Hayman)]. The phrase **μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον** is found in Isa. xxvi. 20, "Go, my people . . . hide thyself *for a very little*, till the indignation be overpast". The double **ὅσον** is found in Aristoph. *Wasps*, 213, where however Rogers thinks the duplication due to the drowsiness of the speaker. Literally it means "a little, how very, how very". The following words from **ὁ ἐρχόμενος** to **ἐν αὐτῷ** are from Heb. ii. 3-4, with some slight alterations, the article being inserted before **ἐρχόμενος, οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ** instead of the less forcible words in Hebrews, and the two clauses of ver. 4 being transposed. In Habakkuk the conditions are similar. God's people are crushed under overwhelming odds. And the question with which Habakkuk opens his prophecy is **ἕως τίνος κεκράξομαι καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσεις**; The Lord assures him that deliverance will come and will not delay. By inserting the article, the writer of Hebrews identifies the deliverer as the Messiah, "the coming One". *Cf.* Mat. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19; Jo. vi. 14. **ὁ δὲ δίκαιος. . . .** "And the just shall live by faith," *i.e.*, shall survive these troublous times by believing that the Lord is at hand. *Cf.* Jas. v. 7-9. **καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται**, "and if he withdraw himself" or "shrink". The verb, as Kypke shows, means to shrink in fear, and it is thus used in Gal. ii. 12. It is the very opposite of **παρρησία**. Accordingly it is thoroughly displeasing to God, whose purpose it is to bring men to Himself in confident hope. But the idea that any of the "Hebrews" can be in so ignominous and dangerous a position is at once repudiated. **ἡμεῖς δὲ. . . .** "But as for us we are not of those who shrink (literally of shrinking) to perdition but of faith to the gaining of the soul". That is, we are not characterised by a timid abandonment of our confession (ver. 23) and confidence. *Cf.* 1 Thess. v. 5. What such timidity leads to (**εἰς ἀπώλειαν**, *cf.* Acts viii. 20; Rom. ix. 22) is hopeless perdition. *Cf.* M. Aurelius on the **δραπέτης**, x. 25. **ὁ φοβούμενος**

μου ἐν αὐτῷ." 39. Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν,
a Rom. viii. 24; 2 Cor. iv. 18. ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς.

XI. 1. [a]Ἔστι δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων

δραπέτης. But we are of faith whose end is **περιποίησις ψυχῆς** the acquisition of one's soul. Very similar is Luke xxi. 19, "By your endurance win your souls". See also James v. 20, and 1 Thess. v. 9. Like our word "acquisition" **περιποίησις** sometimes means the acquiring as in 1 Thess. v. 9 and 2 Thess. ii. 14; sometimes the thing acquired, as in Eph. i. 14. [In Isocrates, 2nd Ep., occurs the expression **διὰ τὸ περιποιῆσαι τὴν αὐτοῦ ψυχήν** (Wetstein)].

CHAPS. XI. 1—XII. 3. That the Hebrews may still further be encouraged to persevere in maintaining faith the writer exhibits in detail its victories in the past history of their people and especially in the life of Jesus. (*Cf. Sirach*, 44-50.)

Ver. 1. **Ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις . . .** "Now faith is assurance of things hoped for, proof [manifestation] of things not seen". When **ἔστι** stands first in a sentence it sometimes means "there exists," as in John v. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 44. But it has not necessarily and always this significance, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 6; Luke viii. 11; Wisdom vii. 1. There is therefore no need to place a comma after **πίστις** as some have done. The words describe what faith is, although not a strict definition. "Longe falluntur, qui justam fidei definitionem hic poni existimant: neque enim hic de tota fidei natura disserit Apostolus, sed partem elegit suo instituto congruentem, nempe quod cum patientia semper conjuncta sit" (Calvin). **ὑπόστασις**, literally foundation, that which stands under; hence, the ground on which one builds a hope, naturally gliding into the meaning "assurance," "confidence," as in iii. 14; 2 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 17; Ruth i. 12; Ps. xxxix. 7, **ἡ ὑπόστασίς μου παρὰ σοί ἐστιν.** **Ἔλεγχος** regularly means "proof". See Demosthenes, *passim*; especially *Agt. Androtion*, p. 600, **ἔλεγχος, ὧν ἂν εἴπῃ τις καὶ τἀληθὲς ὁμοῦ δείξῃ.** It seems never to be used in a subjective sense for "conviction," "persuasion"; although here this meaning would suit the context and has been adopted by many. To say with Weiss that the subjective meaning *must* be given to the word that it may correspond with **ὑπόστασις** is to write the Epistle, not to interpret it. Theophylact renders the clause **φανέρωσις ἀδήλων πραγμάτων.** Faith is that which enables us to treat as real the things that are unseen. Hatch gives a different meaning to both clauses: "Faith is the ground of things hoped for, *i.e.*, trust in God, or the conviction that God is good and that He will perform His promises, is the ground for confident hope that the things hoped for will come to pass. . . . So trust in God furnishes to the mind which has it a clear proof that things to which God has testified exist, though they are not visible to the senses." The words thus become a definition of what faith does, not of what it is. Substantially the words mean that faith gives to things future, which as yet are only hoped for, all the reality of actual present existence; and irresistibly convinces us of the reality of things unseen and brings us into their presence. Things future and things unseen must become certainties to the mind if a balanced life is to be lived. Faith mediating between man and the supersensible is the essential link between himself and God, "for in it lay the commendation of the men of old," **ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι.** That is, it was on the ground of their possessing faith that the distinguished men of the O.T. received the commendation of God, being immortalised in Scripture. It might almost be rendered "by faith of this kind," answering to this description. **ἐν ταύτῃ** has an exact parallel in 1 Tim. v. 10, the widow who is to be placed on the Church register must be **ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη**, well-reported of on the score of good works. **οἱ πρεσβύτεροι**, those of past generations, men of the O.T. times; as Papias [Euseb., *H.E.*, iii. 39] uses the term to denote the "Fathers of the Church" belonging to the generation preceding his own. The idea that faith is that which God finds pleasure in (x. 38) and is that which truly unites to God under the old dispensations as well as under the new is a Pauline thought, Gal. iii. 6. This general statement of ver. 2 is exhibited in detail in the remainder of the chapter; but first the writer shows the excellence of faith in this, that it is by it that we recognise that there is an unseen world and that out of things unseen this visible world has taken

ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. 2. ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσ- b Gen. i. 1; Ps. xxxiii. 6; Rom. iv. 17; 2 Peter iii. 5.
βύτεροι. 3. [b] Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα [1] γεγονέναι. 4. [c] Πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἄβελ παρὰ Κάϊν προσήνεγκε τῷ Θεῷ, δι' ἧς ἐμαρ- c xii. 24; Gen. iv. 4, 10; Matt. xxiii. 35.
τυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ·

[1] το βλεπομενον in ℵAD*E*P, 17, d, e, Copt., Aeth.; T.R. in DcE**KL, f, vg., Syrutr, Arm.

rise. This idea is suggested to him because his eye is on *Genesis* from which he culls the succeeding examples and it is natural that he should begin at the beginning. "Before exhibiting how faith is the principle that rules the life of men in relation to God, down through all history, as it is transacted on the stage of the world, the author shows how this stage itself is brought into connection with God by an act of faith" (Davidson). By faith we perceive, with the mental eye **νοοῦμεν**, *cf.* Rom. i. 20, that the worlds (**αἰῶνας**, *cf.* i. 2; the visible world existing in time, the temporary manifestation of the unseen is meant, see i. 10, 11) have been framed (**κατηρτίσθαι**, as in x. 5, **σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι.** In xiii. 21 **καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς**, "perfect you" as in Luke vi. 40; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 10. The word is perhaps used in the present connection to suggest not a bare calling into existence, but a wise adaptation of part to part and of the whole to its purpose) by God's word, **ῥήματι θεοῦ.** This is the perception of faith. The word of God is an invisible force which cannot be perceived by sense. The great power which lies at the source of all that is does not itself come into observation; we perceive it only by faith which is (ver. 1) "the evidence of things not seen". The result of this creation by an unseen force, the word of God, is that "what is seen has not come into being out of things which appear". **εἰς τὸ . . . γεγονέναι.** **εἰς τὸ** with infinitive, commonly used to express purpose, is sometimes as here used to express result, and we may legitimately translate "so that what is seen, etc." *Cf.* Luke v. 17; Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. viii. 6; Gal. iii. 17; 1 Thess. ii. 16. *Cf.* Burton, *M. and T.*, 411. **μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων,** the Vulgate renders "ex invisibilibus," and the Old Latin "ex non apparentibus" having apparently read **ἐκ μὴ φαιν.** **τὸ βλεπόμενον** the singular in place of the plural of T.R. and Vulgate, presents all things visible as unity. Had the visible world been formed out of materials which were subject to human observation, there would have been no room for faith. Science could have traced it to its origin. Evolution only pushes the statement a stage back. There is still an unseen force that does not submit itself to experimental science, and that is the object of faith. To find in this verse an allusion to the noumenal and phenomenal worlds would be fanciful.

Ver. 4. **πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν. . . .** "By faith Abel offered to God a more adequate sacrifice than Cain." **πλείονα** literally "more," but frequently used to express "higher in value" "greater in worth," as in Mat. xii. 41, 42. **πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε,** Luke xii. 23; Rev. ii. 19. Does the writer mean that faith prompted Abel to make a richer sacrifice, or that it was richer because offered in faith? Many interpreters prefer the former alternative; ["Der grössere Wert seines Opfers ruhte auf dem Glauben, der Herzenshingabe, die ihn das Beste der Herde wählen liess" (Kübel).] and the choice of the word **πλείονα** is certainly in favour of this interpretation. **δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη . . .** "through which he was certified [or attested] as righteous". It is questioned whether **ἧς** is the relative of **θυσίαν** or of **πίστει.** The succeeding clause which states the ground of the attestation, **ἐπὶ τ. δώροις,** determines that it refers to **θυσίαν.** God bore witness **ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ,** which is explained in Genesis iv. 4 where it says **ἐπεῖδεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἄβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ.** God looked favourably on Abel and on his gifts. How this favourable reception of his offering was intimated to Abel we are not told; but by this testimony Abel was pronounced **δίκαιος,** not "justified" in the Pauline sense but in the general sense "a righteous man"; as in Mat. xxiii. 35 **ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου.** But this is not all that faith did for Abel, for **καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ,** "and through the same he, though dead, yet speaks," *i.e.*, speaks notwithstanding

καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖται. 5. [d] Πίστει Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη
τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καὶ "οὐχ εὑρίσκετο,[1] διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ
Θεός"· πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταθέσεως αὐτοῦ μεμαρτύρηται "εὐηρεστηκέναι
τῷ Θεῷ"· 6. χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστῆσαι· πιστεῦσαι
γὰρ δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἐστὶ, καὶ τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν
αὐτὸν μισθαποδότης γίνεται. 7. [e] Πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ

[d] Gen. v. 24; Ecclus. xliv. 16, et xlix. 14.
[e] Gen. vi. 13; Ecclus. xliv. 17; Rom. iii. 22; Phil. iii. 9.

[1] ηυρισκετο in ℵADE.

death. His death was not the end of him as Cain expected it to be. Abel's blood cried for justice. The words of xii. 24 are at once suggested, **αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ**, where the blood of sprinkling is said to speak to better purpose than the blood of Abel. This again takes us back to Gen. iv. 10. "The voice of thy brother's blood cries to me from the ground." The speaking referred to, therefore, is not the continual voice of Abel's example but the voice of his blood crying to God immediately after his death. *Cf.* Ps. ix. 12 and cxvi. 15. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." In the case of Abel, then, the excellence of faith was illustrated in two particulars, it prompted him to offer a richer, more acceptable offering, and it found for him a place in God's regard even after his death.

Ver. 5. **Πίστει Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη. . . .** "By faith Enoch was translated so that he did not see death; and he was not found, because God had translated him. For before his translation he had witness borne to him that he had pleased God well; but without faith it is impossible to please Him well." In the dry catalogue of antediluvian longevities a gem of faith is detected. What lay at the root of Enoch's translation? Faith, because before he was translated he was well-pleasing to God, which implies that he believed in God, or as Chrysostom neatly puts it: **πῶς δὲ πίστει μετετέθη ὁ Ἐνώχ; ὅτι τῆς μεταθέσεως ἡ εὐαρέστησις αἰτία, τῆς δὲ εὐαρεστήσεως ἡ πίστις.** In Ecclus. xliv. 16 he is exhibited as **ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς. μετετέθη** "was transferred," removed from one place to another, as in Acts vii. 16, *cf.* also Gal. i. 6, Jude 4. In Ecclus. lxix. 14 it is represented by **ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.** The succeeding clauses imply that his body disappeared. How the tradition arose we have no means of knowing, *cf.* Suicer, i. 1130, and the Bible Dictionaries. **τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν** may either imply purpose or result. For the former see Mat. ii. 13, Luke ii. 24, Phil. iii. 10; for the latter, Mat. xxi. 32, Acts vii. 19, Rom. vii. 3, Heb. x. 7. The use of the passive **μετετέθη** favours the supposition that result is here expressed, and throughout the sentence it is the translation that is prominent rather than the escape from death, which is introduced rather as an explanation of **μετετέθη. καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο. . . .** These words are verbatim from the LXX of Gen. v. 24, and are quoted for the sake of bringing out clearly that God was the author of the translation. (*Cf.* the misquotation in Clem. *Ep.*, chap. 9, **οὐχ εὑρέθη αὐτοῦ θάνατος.**) God translated him, and this is proved by the fact that preceding the statement of his translation Scripture records that he pleased God well, where the Hebrew has "he walked with God". **χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστῆσαι.** "But without faith it is impossible to please Him well." The ground of this proposition is given in the following words: **πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον. . . .** "For he who cometh to God must believe that He exists and that to those who seek Him He turns out to be a rewarder." To please God one must draw near to Him (**τὸν προσερχόμενον** in the semi-technical sense usual in the Epistle), and no one can draw near who has not these two beliefs that God is and will reward those who seek Him. So that Enoch's faith, and the faith of every one who approaches God, verifies the description of ver. 1: the unseen must be treated as sufficiently demonstrated, and the hoped for reward must be considered substantial.

Ver. 7. **Πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε. . . .** "By faith Noah, on being divinely warned of things not as yet seen, with reverential heed prepared an ark to save his household." Both here and in Mat. ii. 12, 22 **χρηματ.** is translated "warned of God," although "divinely instructed" as in viii. 5 is admissible in all the passages. **πίστει** must be construed with **εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκεύασεν** and these words must be kept together, although some join **εὐλαβηθεὶς** with

τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων, εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκεύασε κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ· δι' ἧς κατέκρινε τὸν κόσμον, καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος. 8. [f] Πίστει καλούμενος [1] Ἀβραὰμ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον ὃν ἤμελλε λαμβάνειν εἰς [f] Gen. xii. 1, 4; Acts vii. 2.

[1] **ο καλουμενος** in AD* 17, Arm., a reading which Calvin censures as "nimio dilutum ac frigidum".

the preceding words. **τῶν μηδέπω βλεπ**, *i.e.*, the flood; *cf.* Gen vi. 14. **εὐλαβηθεὶς** here used in preference to **φοβηθεὶς** because it is not a timorous dread of the catastrophe that is signified, but a commendable caution springing from regard to God's word. In obedience to this feeling he prepared an ark [**κιβωτὸν** used of the ark of the covenant in ix. 4, and of Noah's ship in Gen. vi. 15, because it was shaped like a box with a roof. In Wisdom x. 4 it is spoken of as "worthless timber," to magnify the salvation accomplished by its means. **δι' εὐτελοῦς ξύλου τὸν δίκαιον (Σοφία) κυβερνήσασα** and in Wisdom xiv. 7 it is **ξύλον δι' οὗ γίνεται δικαιοσύνη.**] This ark he built for the saving of his family; as in Gen. vii. 1 God says to Noah, **εἴσελθε σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου.** By this faith [**δι' ἧς**] and its manifestation in preparing the ark, "he condemned the world"; of which the most obvious meaning is that Noah's faith threw into relief the unbelief of those about him. *Cf.* Mat. xii. 41. But to this, Weiss objects that in Hebrews **κόσμος** is not used to denote the world of men. He therefore concludes that what is meant is that Noah by building the ark for his own rescue showed that he considered the world doomed, thus passing judgment upon it. Certainly the former meaning is the more natural and the objection of Weiss has little weight. A second result of his faith was that "he entered into possession of the righteousness which faith carries with it". The original significance of **κληρονόμος** is here, as often elsewhere, left behind. It means little more than "owner". But no doubt underneath the word there lies the idea, familiar to the Jewish mind, that spiritual blessings are a heritage bestowed by God. **ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη** is rendered by Winer (p. 502) "the righteousness which is in consequence of faith" and he instructively compares Mat. xix. 3, **ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν**, and Acts iii. 17, **κατ' ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε.** The first statement in the history of Noah (Gen. vi. 10) is, **Νῶε ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος, τέλειος ὢν ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ, τῷ θεῷ εὐηρέστησε Νῶε.** *Cf.* Wisdom x. 4. In Genesis the warning of God is communicated to Noah because he was already righteous; in Hebrews a somewhat different aspect is presented, Noah "became" righteous by building the ark in faith. He was one of those who **διὰ πίστεως ἠργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην**, ver. 33.

From ver. 8 to ver. 22 the faith of the patriarchs is exhibited, *cf.* Ecclus. xliv. 19.

Ver. 8. **Πίστει καλούμενος Ἀβραὰμ. . . .** "By faith Abraham on being called to go out to a place which he was to receive as an inheritance, obeyed and went out not knowing whither he was going." **καλούμενος**, as in Mark i. 20 and Isa. li. 2, **ἐμβλέψατε Ἀβραὰμ . . . ὅτι εἷς ἦν, καὶ ἐκάλεσα αὐτόν.** The present, not **κληθεὶς**, expresses the idea that no sooner was the call given than it was obeyed ["dass er, so wie der Ruf an ihn ging, gehorsamte" (Bleek)]. The same idea is expressed by the immediate introduction of **ὑπήκουσεν**, which more naturally would come at the end of the clause, and thus allow **ἐξελθεῖν** (*cf.* Gen. xii. 1; Acts vii. 2) to follow **καλούμενος.** The faith of Abraham appeared in his promptly abandoning his own country on God's promise of another, and the strength of this faith was illustrated by the circumstance that he had no knowledge where or what that country was. He went out **μὴ ἐπιστάμενος ποῦ ἔρχεται.** The terms of the call (Gen. xii. 1) were **ἔξελθε . . . καὶ δεῦρο εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ἄν σοι δείξω.** It was, therefore, no attractive account of Canaan which induced him to forsake Mesopotamia, no ordinary emigrant's motive which moved him, but mere faith in God's promise. "Even still the life of faith must be entered on in ignorance of the way to the inheritance, or even what the inheritance and rest in each one's particular case will be, and of the experiences that the way will bring. This is true even of ordinary life" (Davidson). This did not exhaust the faith of Abraham. Further **πίστει παρῴκησεν. . . .** "By faith he became a sojourner in a land [his] by the promise as if it belonged to another, dwelling in tents, along with

κληρονομίαν, καὶ ἐξῆλθε μὴ ἐπιστάμενος ποῦ ἔρχεται. 9. Πίστει παρῴκησεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν, ἐν σκηναῖς
g iii. 4, et xii. 22, et xiii. 14; Apoc. xxi. 2. κατοικήσας μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ τῶν συγκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς· 10. [g] ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν
h Gen. xvii. 19, et xxi. 2; Luc. i. 36; Rom. iv. 19. πόλιν, ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ Θεός. 11. [h] Πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος ἔλαβε, καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας ἔτεκεν, ἐπεὶ πιστὸν ἡγήσατο τὸν

Isaac and Jacob, co-heirs with him of the same promise." **παρῴκησεν**, as in Acts vii. 6, **πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ**, dwelt alongside of the proper inhabitants. *Cf.* Gen. xvii. 8 and *passim*. **εἰς** in its common pregnant sense, Jo. xxi. 4; Acts viii. 40; Pet. v. 12 and especially Acts vii. 4. He lived in the promised land, **ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν**, as if it belonged to some other person; neither did he make a permanent settlement in it but dwelt in tents, shifting from place to place, the symbol of what is temporary, see Isa. xxxviii. 12; 2 Cor. v. 4. The presence of his son and grandson must continually have prompted him to settle. They were included in the promise, but they too were compelled to move with him from place to place. But how did this evince faith? It did so by showing that he had given a wider scope and a deeper significance to God's words. He was content to dwell in tents, because he looked for "the city which has the foundations". **ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν . . . πόλιν.** "For he expectantly waited for the city." **ἐκδέχομαι** (Jas. v. 7, **ὁ γεωργὸς ἐκδεχ.**, Acts xvii. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 33) occurs in Soph. *Phil.*, 123, where Jebb says: "The idea of the compound is 'be ready for him,' prepared to deal with him the moment he appears". The city is described as one "that has the foundations" which the tents lacked, and which according to xiii. 14 is by implication not only **μέλλουσαν** but **μένουσαν**. In xii. 22 it is called "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," and in Gal. iv. 26 **ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ**. A city was the symbol of a settled condition, as in Ps. cvii. 7, **πόλις κατοικητηρίου**. *Cf.* the interesting parallel in Philo. *Leg. Alleg.*, iii.-xxvi., p. 103, **πόλις δέ ἐστιν ἀγαθὴ καὶ πολλὴ καὶ σφόδρα εὐδαίμων, τὰ γὰρ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ μεγάλα καὶ τίμια.** It is further described as **ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός**, "whose constructer and maker is God". **τεχνίτης** is used of the silversmiths in Acts xix. 24, of God as Maker of the world in Wisdom xiii. 1 and xiv. 2, **τεχνίτης δὲ σοφίᾳ κατεσκεύασεν.** Perhaps "artificer" comes nearest to the meaning. **δημιουργός**, originally one who works for the people, but applied by Plato (*Rep.*, p. 530) to God; and so, very often in Josephus and Philo (see Krebs, *in loc.*). For the use of the title among the Gnostics, see Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, p. 19. In Clement, *Ep.*, 20, we have **ὁ μέγας δημιουργὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων.** In 2 Macc. iv. 1, **τῶν κακῶν δημιουργός.** "Maker" most adequately translates the word. Wetstein shows that **τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς** was not an uncommon combination and aptly compares Cicero (*De Nat. D.*, i. 8) "Opificem aedificatorem mundi". The statement of this verse shows that Abraham and other enlightened O.T. saints (*cf.* chap. iv.) understood that their connection with God, the Eternal One, was their great possession, of which earthly gifts and blessings were but present manifestations.

Ver. 11. **Πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα. . . .** "By faith Sarah herself also received power to become a mother even when past the age, since she counted Him faithful who had promised." **καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα** is rendered by Vaughan, Sarah "in her place" as [Abraham] in his; she on her part. The reference of **αὐτὴ** is disputed; it has been understood to mean "Sarah the unfruitful". In D. **στεῖρα** is added; or, as Chrysostom and Bengel, "vas infirmius," the weaker vessel. Delitzsch thinks that as in Luke xx. 42, xxiv. 15, it merely means, "so Sarah likewise". But apparently the reference is to her previous unbelief. By faith she received strength **εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος**, "the act of the husband not of the wife" (see a score of passages in Wetstein), hence Bleek, Farrar and several others prefer to understand the words of "the founding of a family," citing Plato's **πρώτη καταβολὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.** But if **εἰς** be taken in the same sense as in x. 19, "as regards" or "in connection with" or "with a view to," the difficulty disappears. [*Cf.* Weiss who says the words signify "nicht ein Thun, zu dem sie Kraft empfing, sondern die Beziehung in welcher sie ein Kraft

ἐπαγγειλάμενον. 12. [i]διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἑνὸς ἐγεννήθησαν, καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου, καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει, καὶ ὡσεὶ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ ἀναρίθμητος. 13. [k]Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ λαβόντες[1] τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες, καὶ πεισθέντες[2] καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι, καὶ ὁμο-

i Gen. xv. 5, et xxii. 17; Rom. iv. 18.
k Gen. xxiii. 4, et xlvii. 9; 1 Par. xxix. 15; Ps. xxxix. 12, et cxix. 19; Joan. viii. 56.

[1] T.R. in ℵ[c]DEKL; μη κομισαμενοι in ℵ*P, 17, 23, 71; μη προσδεξαμενοι in A.
[2] και πεισθεντες omitted in ℵADEKLP, and verss.

bedürfte, wenn dasselbe für sie wirksam werden sollte". *Cf.* also Gen. xviii. 12.] Her faith was further illustrated (**καὶ** = and this indeed) by the circumstance that she was now **παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας**, the comparative use of **παρά** frequent in this Epistle. For a woman who in her prime had been barren, to believe that in her decay she could bear a son was a triumph of faith. *Cf.* Gen. xviii. 12-13, **ἐγὼ δὲ γεγήρακα.** But she had faith in the promise (*cf.* vi. 13-18), "wherefore also there were begotten of one—and him as good as dead—[issue] as the stars of heaven in multitude and as the sand by the seashore innumerable". Probably the **καὶ** is to be construed with **διὸ** as in Luke i. 35; Acts x. 29, etc. **ἀφ' ἑνὸς**, that is, Abraham (*cf.* Isa. li. 2, **εἷς ἦν**); **καὶ ταῦτα**, a classical expression, see Xenophon, *Mem.*, ii. 3, and Blass, *Gram.*, p. 248. **νενεκρωμένον**, "dead" so far as regards the begetting of offspring, *cf.* Rom. iv. 19. **καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα**, a nominative to **ἐγεν.** may be supplied, **ἔκγονοι** or **σπέρμα.** For the metaphors *cf.* Gen. xxii. 17. **ἄστρον** is properly a constellation, but used commonly for "a star". **χεῖλος** found in the classics in same connection.

Ver. 13. Not only in life was the faith of the patriarchs manifested, it stood the test of death, **κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες**, in keeping with their faith (see Winer, p. 502) these all (that is Abraham, Sarah, Isaac and Jacob) died, and the strength of their faith was seen in this that although they had not received the fulfilment of the promises (ver. 39 and x. 36) they yet had faith enough to see and hail them from afar. As Moses endured because he *saw* the Invisible (ver. 27) so the patriarchs were not daunted by death because they saw the day of Christ (John viii. 56), that is to say, they were so firmly persuaded that God's promise would be fulfilled that it could be said that they *saw* the fulfilment. They hailed them from afar, as those on board ship descry friends on shore and wave a recognition. [Wetstein cites from Appian, *De Bell. Civ.*, ver. 46, p. 110 where it is said that the soldiers **τὸν Καίσαρα πόῤῥωθεν ὡς αὐτοκράτορα ἠσπάσαντο.**] "Such an **ἀσπασμός** we have in the mouth of the dying Jacob (Gen. xlix. 18): For Thy salvation have I waited, Jehovah" (Delitzsch). This they might have done had they merely believed that the promises would be fulfilled to their descendants, but that their faith extended also to their own enjoyment of God's promise was testified by their confessing that so far as regards the land (**τῆς γῆς**) of Canaan they were pilgrims and foreigners. This confession was made no doubt by their whole conduct, but as the aorist indicates it was made verbally by Abraham on the occasion of Sarah's death (Gen. xxiii. 4), **πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγώ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν**, *cf.* xlvii. 9, etc. The article before **γῆς**, together with the sense of the passage, shows that the land of promise, Canaan, was meant. **ἐπὶ γῆς** in the same connection is used for "the earth," *cf.* 1 Chron. xxix. 15. Philo (*De Agricult.*, p. 196) refines upon the same idea, **παροικεῖν οὐ κατοικεῖν ἤλθομεν· τῷ γὰρ ὄντι πᾶσα μὲν ψυχὴ σοφοῦ πατρίδα μὲν οὐρανὸν, ξένην δὲ γῆν ἔλαχεν.** *Cf. De Conf. Ling.*, p. 331. But such a confession implies that those who make it (**οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες**) have not yet found but are in search of a fatherland, **πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσιν.** [*Cf.* Rom. xi. 7, **ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν.** Frequent in N.T., to seek, search for. "The **ἐπὶ** is that of direction, as the **ἐκ** in **ἐκζητεῖν** (ver. 6) is that of explanation" (Vaughan).] The acknowledgment, cheerful or sad, that such and such a land is not the home-country makes it manifest (**ἐμφανίζουσιν**, Jo. xiv. 21, Acts xxiii. 15) that they think of and have in view and are making for a land which they can call their own. ["Si hic peregrinantur, alibi patria est ac fixa sedes" (Calvin).] And that this home-country of their desire is not that from which Abraham and the patriarchs were really derived (Mesopo-

λογήσαντες ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 14. οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες, ἐμφανίζουσιν ὅτι πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσι. 15. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημόνευον ἀφ' ἧς ἐξῆλθον,[1] εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι· 16. [1] νυνὶ [2] δὲ κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τουτέστιν ἐπουρανίου· διὸ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς, Θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν· ἡτοίμασε γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν. 17. [m] Πίστει προσενήνοχεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ πειραζόμενος, καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν ὁ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀνα-

1 Exod. iii. 6; Matt. xxii. 32; Acts vii. 32.

m Gen. xxii. 2, etc.; Eccl. xliv. 20.

[1] T.R. in ℵcDcE**KL; εξεβησαν in ℵ*AD*E*P, 17, 73.
[2] T.R. in minusculis; νυν in ℵADEKLP.

tamia) and which they had abandoned, (**ἀφ' ἧς ἐξέβησαν**) is also evident, because had they cherished fond memories of it they would have had opportunity (**εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν**, *cf.* Acts xxiv. 25; 1 Macc. xv. 34. The imperfects indicate that this was continuous) to return (**ἀνακάμψαι**, Mat. ii. 12; Luke x. 6; Acts xviii. 21; frequent in LXX). **νῦν δὲ**, "but as the case actually stands" (viii. 6, ix. 26; 1 Cor. xv. 20, etc.) putting aside this idea that it might be their old home they were seeking, **κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐπουρανίου**, it is a better, that is, a heavenly they aspire after. That which in point of fact provoked in the patriarchs the sense of exile was that their hearts were set on a better country and firmer settlement than could be found anywhere, but in heaven. And because they thus proved that they were giving to God credit for meaning by His promises more than the letter indicated, because they measured His promises by the spirit of the promises rather than by the thing promised, He is not ashamed of them, not ashamed to be called their God; and the proof that He is not ashamed of them is, that He prepared for them a city. The patriarchs showed that they understood that in giving these promises God became their God; therefore God was not ashamed of them, and this showed itself especially in His naming Himself "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (Exod. iii. 15). *Cf.* with this verse, viii. 10 and Mat. xxii. 31, 32. And that He was truly their God He showed by preparing for them a city which should justify the expectations which they had based upon His power and goodness.

Ver. 17. **Πίστει προσενήνοχεν Ἀβραὰμ. . . .** "By faith Abraham when tried offered up Isaac, yea he who had accepted the promises, to whom it had been said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called, offered his only son." The perfect **προσενήνοχεν**, Blass (*Gram.*, 200) says "can only be understood as referring to the abiding example offered to us". Similarly Alford, Westcott, Weiss, etc. Surely it is better to have regard to Burton's statement, "The Perfect Indicative is sometimes used in the N.T. of a simple past fact where it is scarcely possible to suppose that the thought of existing result was in the writer's mind". And in Jebb's Appendix to Vincent and Dickson's *Gram. of Mod. Greek* (p. 327, 8) it is demonstrated that "later Greek shows some clear traces of a tendency to use the Perfect as an Aorist". **τὸν** is probably here intended not merely to indicate the case of the indeclinable **Ἰσαὰκ** (Vaughan), *cf.* vv. 18, 20, but to call attention to the importance of Isaac; and this is further accomplished in the succeeding clause which brings out the full significance of the sacrifice. It was his only son whom Abraham was offering (**προσέφερε** imperfect in its proper sense of an unfinished transaction) and therefore the sole link between himself and the fulfilment of the promises to which he had given hospitable entertainment (**ἀναδεξάμενος**, 2 Macc. vi. 19). "The sole link," because, irrespective of any other children Abraham had had or might have, it had been said to him (**πρὸς ὃν**, denoting Abraham not Isaac), In Isaac shall a seed be named to thee (Gen. xxi. 12); that is to say, it is Isaac and his descendants who shall be known as Abraham's seed. Others are proud to count themselves the descendants of Abraham but the true "seed" (**κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα**, *cf.* Gal. iii. 16, 29) to whom along with Abraham the promises were given was the race that sprang from Isaac, the heir of the promise. No trial (**πειραζόμενος** as in Gen. xxii. 1, **ὁ Θεὸς ἐπείρασε τὸν Ἀβραὰμ** and *cf.* Gen. xxii. 12) could have been more severe. After long waiting the heir had at last been given, and now after his hope had for several years rooted itself in this one life, he is required to sacrifice

δεξάμενος, 18. [n] πρὸς ὃν ἐλαλήθη, "Ὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα". 19. λογισάμενος ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν[1] δυνατὸς ὁ Θεὸς, ὅθεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο. 20. [o] Πίστει περὶ μελλόντων εὐλόγησεν[2] Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακὼβ καὶ τὸν Ἡσαῦ. 21. [p] Πίστει Ἰακὼβ ἀποθνήσκων ἕκαστον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσὴφ εὐλόγησε[3]· καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. 22. [q] Πίστει Ἰωσὴφ τελευτῶν περὶ τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐμνημόνευσε, καὶ περὶ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ ἐνετείλατο. 23. [r] Πίστει Μωσῆς γεννηθεὶς ἐκρύβη τρίμηνον ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, διότι εἶδον ἀστεῖον τὸ παιδίον· καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διάταγμα[4] τοῦ βασιλέως. 24. [s] Πίστει Μωσῆς

n Gen. xxi. 12; Rom. ix. 7; Gal. iii. 29.
o Gen. xxvii. 27, 39.
p Gen. xlvii. 31, et xlviii. 5, 15, 16, 20.
q Gen. l. 24.
r Exod. i. 16, et ii. 2; Acts vii. 20.
s Exod. ii. 10, 11; Ps. lxxxiv. 10.

[1] εγειρειν in ℵDEKL; εγειραι in AP, 17, 71.
[2] ηυλογησεν in A, 17, 37.
[3] ηυλογησεν in ADE, 17.
[4] δογμα in Avi, 34.

that life and so break his whole connection with the future. No greater test of his trust in God was possible. He conquered because he reckoned (**λογισάμενος** "expresses the formation of an opinion by *calculation* or *reasoning*, as in Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. x. 7" (Vaughan).), that even from the dead God is able to raise up—a belief in God's power to do this universally, see John v. 21. This belief enabled him to deliver his only son to death. "Whence (**ὅθεν**, *i.e.*, **ἐκ νεκρῶν**, although several commentators, even Weiss, render it 'wherefore') also he received him back (**ἐκομίσατο**, for this meaning see Gen. xxxviii. 20 and passages in Wetstein) in a figure (**ἐν παραβολῇ**, not actually, because Isaac had not been dead, but virtually because he had been given up to death. He had passed through the likeness of death, and his restoration to Abraham was a likeness of resurrection. (Whoever wishes to see how a simple expression may be tortured should consult Alford's long note on this place.)

Ver. 20. **Πίστει περὶ μελλόντων. . . .** "By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau in regard to things future," as is recorded in the well-known passage, Gen. xxvii. Isaac thus in his turn exhibited a faith which could be described as **ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις.** "By faith Jacob when dying (**ἀποθνήσκων** *cf.* **καλούμενος**, ver. 8, and **πειραζόμενος**, ver. 17: the participle illustrates ver. 13 and also reminds the reader that Jacob before he died saw his children's children inheriting the promise ("thy two sons are mine," Gen. xlviii. 5) blessed each of the sons of Joseph. **ἕκαστον τ. υἱῶν**, that is, he gave each an individual blessing, crossing his hands, laying his right on the head of Ephraim the younger, his left on Manasseh, thus distinguishing between the destiny of the one and that of the other and so more abundantly illustrating his faith. **καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ,** "and worshipped leaning upon the top of his staff". The words are from the LXX rendering of Gen. xlvii. 31 where after Joseph had sworn to bury his father in Canaan, "Israel worshipped, etc.". His exacting this promise from Joseph was proof of his faith that his posterity would inherit the land of promise. The LXX translating from an unpointed text read הַמַּטֶּה the staff and not as it is now read הַמִּטָּה the bed, (as in xlviii. 2). The meaning in either case is that in extreme bodily weakness, either unable to leave his bed or if so only able to stand with the aid of a staff, his faith was yet untouched by the slightest symptom of decay. "The idea of **προσκυνεῖν** is that of *reverence shown in posture*" (Vaughan). Here Jacob "worshipped" in thankful remembrance of the promise of God and that his son had accepted it.

Ver. 22. Similarly Joseph when he in his turn came to the close of his life (**τελευτῶν**, from Gen. l. 26, **καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰωσὴφ**) made mention of the exodus of the children of Israel ("God will surely visit you and will bring you out of this land to the land concerning which God sware to our fathers," Gen. l. 24) and gave commandment concerning his bones ("ye shall carry up my bones hence with you," Gen. l. 25. For the fulfilment of the command see Josh. xxiv. 32).

Vv. 23-31. The writer passes from the patriarchal age to the times of Moses and the Judges.

μέγας γενόμενος ἠρνήσατο λέγεσθαι υἱὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ, 25. μᾶλλον ἑλόμενος συγκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ πρόσκαιρον ἔχειν ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν· 26. μείζονα πλοῦτον ἡγησάμενος τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ θησαυρῶν τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀπέβλεπε γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν. 27. [t] Πίστει κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον, μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως· τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησε. 28. [u] Πίστει πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος,

t Exod. x. 28, 29, et xii. 31, etc., et xiii. 17, etc.

u Exod. xii. 3, 21, 22.

First the faith of the parents of Moses (**τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ**, in Stephanus' *Thesaur*, several examples are given of the use of **πατέρες** for "father and mother," parents; and consider Eph. vi. 4 and Col. iii. 21) is celebrated. This faith was shown in their concealing Moses for three months after his birth and thus evading the law that male children were to be killed, called in Wisd. xi. 7 **νηπιοκτόνον διάταγμα.** They did not fear this commandment of the king. It did not weigh against the child's beauty which betokened that he was destined for something great. Their faith consisted in their confidence that God had in store for so handsome a child an exceptional career and would save him to fulfil his destiny. In Acts vii. 20 Stephen calls him **ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ**, extraordinarily beautiful (*cf.* Jonah iii. 3) or as Philo, *De Mos.*, p. 82, **ὄψιν ἀστειοτέραν ἢ κατ' ἰδιώτην**, indicating that he had a corresponding destiny. Moses himself when he had grown up (**μέγας γενόμενος**, as in Exod. ii. 11 paraphrased by Stephen (Acts vii. 23) **ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετὴς χρόνος**,) refused to be called a son of a daughter of Pharaoh. The significance and source of this refusal lay in his preferring to suffer illusage with God's people rather than to have a short-lived enjoyment of sin. **συνκακ.**, the simple verb in ver. 37, also xiii. 3; the compound here only. **τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ**, it was because they were God's people, not solely because they were of his blood, that Moses threw in his lot with them. It was this which illustrated his faith. He believed that God would fulfil His promise to His people, little likelihood as at present there seemed to be of any great future for his race. On the other hand there was the **ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσις**, the enjoyment which was within his reach if only he committed the sin of denying his people and renouncing their future as promised by God. For "the enjoyment to be reaped from sin" does not refer to the pleasure of gratifying sensual appetite and so forth, but to the satisfaction of a high ambition and the gratification of his finer tastes which he might have had by remaining in the Egyptian court. Very similarly Philo interprets the action of Moses, who, he says, "esteemed the good things of those who had adopted him, although more splendid for a season, to be in reality spurious, but those of his natural parents, although for a little while less conspicuous, to be true and genuine" (*De Mose*, p. 86). That which influenced Moses to make this choice was his estimate of the comparative value of the outcome of suffering with God's people and of the happiness offered in Egypt. **μείζονα πλοῦτον . . . εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν**, "since he considered the reproach of the Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; for he steadily kept in view the reward". The reproach or obloquy and disgrace, which Moses experienced is called "the reproach of the Christ" because it was on account of his belief in God's saving purpose that he suffered. The expression is interpreted by our Lord's statement that Abraham saw his day. It does not imply that Moses believed that a personal Christ was to come, but only that God would fulfil that promise which in point of fact was fulfilled in the coming of Christ. The writer uses the expression rather with a view to his readers who were shrinking from the reproach of Christ (xiii. 13), than from the point of view of Moses. Several interpreters (Delitzsch, etc.) suppose that in virtue of the mystical union Christ suffered in his people. But, as Davidson says, "this mystical union cannot be shown to be an idea belonging to the Epistle, nor is this sense pertinent to the connection." (So Weiss, "die vorstellung liegt unserem Briefe fern".) Weiss' own interpretation is ingenious: "The O.T. church was created by the pre-existent Messiah to be the people who were destined to introduce through Him perfect salvation; therefore each maltreatment of this people was contempt of

ἵνα μὴ ὁ ὀλοθρεύων[1] τὰ πρωτότοκα θίγῃ αὐτῶν. 29. [v] Πίστει διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς· ἧς πεῖραν λαβόντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι κατεπόθησαν. 30. [w] Πίστει τὰ τείχη Ἰεριχὼ ἔπεσε,[2] κυκλωθέντα ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας. 31. [x] Πίστει Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐ συναπώλετο τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι, δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ' εἰρήνης.

v Exod. xiv. 21, 22.

w Jos. vi. 20.

x Jos. ii. 1, et vi. 23; Jac. ii. 25.

[1] ολεθρευων in ADE. [2] επεσαν in ℵAD*P, 17, 23, 71.

Him as unable to avenge and deliver His people". To say that it means merely "the same reproach that Christ bore" scarcely satisfies the expression. The "treasures of Egypt" must be supposed to include all that had been accumulated during centuries of civilisation. **ἀπέβλεπεν,** he habitually kept in view the reward. *Cf.* Xen., *Hist.*, vi. 1, 8 **ἡ σὴ πατρὶς εἰς σὲ ἀποβλέπει,** also Ps. xi. 4, Philo, *De Opif.*, p. 4. **κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον,** "he forsook Egypt," and fled to Midian. That this flight and not the Exodus is meant appears from the connection of the clause both with what precedes and with what follows. It exhibits the result of his choice (ver. 26), and it alludes to what preceded the Passover (ver. 28). The word **ἐκαρτέρησεν,** denoting long continued endurance also suits better this reference. The only difficulty in the way of accepting this interpretation is found in the words **μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως,** because, according to Exod. ii. 15, the motive of his flight was fear of the king. **ἐφοβήθη δὲ Μωυσῆς.** But what is in the writer's mind is not Pharaoh's wrath as cause but as consequence of Moses' abandonment of Egypt. His flight showed that he had finally renounced life at court, and in thus indicating by this decisive action that he was an Israelite, and meant to share with his people, he braved the king's wrath. This he was strengthened to do because he saw an invisible monarch greater than Pharaoh. Vaughan seems the only interpreter who has precisely hit the writer's meaning: "the two fears are different, the one is the fear arising from the discovery of his slaying the Egyptian, the other is the fear of Pharaoh's anger on discovering his flight. *He feared and therefore fled: he feared not, and therefore fled.*" Having fled and so cutting himself off from all immediate opportunity of helping his people, **ἐκαρτέρησεν,** "he steadfastly bided his time," because he saw the Invisible, being thus an eminent illustration of faith as **ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων.** The aorist gathers the forty years in Midian into one exhibition of wonderful perseverance in faith. It was the upper form of the school which disciplined Moses and wrought him to the mould of a hero. Another point in his career at which faith manifested itself was the Exodus, **πεποίηκεν τὸ πάσχα,** "he hath celebrated the Passover". Alford says the perfect is used on account of the Passover being "a still enduring Feast". But it is Moses' celebration of it that the perfect represents as enduring. The classical treatment of the question, Has **ποιεῖν** a sacrificial meaning in the N.T.? will be found in Prof. T. K. Abbott's *Essays*. **ποιεῖν** is regularly used of "keeping" a feast; and this is a classical usage as well. *Cf.* Exod. xii. 48, xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 22; 2 Chron. xxxv. 17-19. **τὸ πάσχα** originally the paschal lamb, Exod. xii. 21, **καὶ θύσατε τὸ πάσχα,** Mark xiv. 12 **τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον,** hence the feast of Passover as in Luke xxii. 1. It is written **φασέκ** throughout 2 Chron. xxx. and xxxv., also in Jer. xxxviii. 8. **καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος,** "and the affusion of the blood" the sprinkling of the blood on the door posts as commanded in Exod. xii. 7, 22, the object being that the destroyers of the first-borns might not touch them. As **θιγγάνω** is followed by a genitive in xii. 20 it is probable that the writer here also meant it to govern **αὐτῶν** while **πρωτότοκα** follows **ὀλοθρεύων.** So R.V. **ὁ ὀλοθρεύων** is taken from Exod. xii. 23. **πρωτότοκα,** first-borns of man and also of beasts, Exod. xii. 12. **αὐτῶν** is naturally referred to "the people of God," ver. 25. It was a noteworthy faith which enabled Moses confidently to promise the people protection from the general destruction. On their part also there was the manifestation of a strong faith. **διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν . . .** "they passed through the Red sea as if on dry land". The nominative must be taken out of **αὐτῶν.** **διέβησαν,** the usual term for crossing a river or a space. The Red sea is in Hebrew "the Sea of [red] weeds". **διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς** as in

y Jud. iv. 6, et vi. 11, et xi. 1, et xii. 7, et xiii. 24; 1 Sam. i. 20, et xii. 17, etc., et xiii. 14, et xvii. 45.

32. ʸ Καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω; ἐπιλείψει γάρ με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεών, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψὼν καὶ Ἰεφθάε, Δαβίδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ

Exod. xiv. 29 **ἐπορεύθησαν διὰ ξηρᾶς ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης,** also xv. 19; and *cf.* the various impressions in the Psalms which celebrate the great deliverance. The greatness of the people's faith is accentuated by the fate of the Egyptians, whose attempt to follow was audacity and presumption not faith. **ἧς πεῖραν λαβόντες . . .** "of which [*i.e.*, of the sea] making trial the Egyptians were swallowed up," Exod. xv. 4 **κατεπόθησαν ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ.** Another instance of the faith of the people and its effects is found in the fall of the walls of Jericho. The greatness of the faith may be measured by the difficulty we now have in believing that the walls fell without the application of any visible force. God's promise was, **πεσεῖται αὐτόματα τὰ τείχη,** and believing this promise the people compassed the city seven days. The greatness of their faith was further exhibited in their continuing to compass the city day after day, for in the promise (Josh. vi. 1-5) no mention is made of any delay in its fulfilment and the natural inference would be that the walls would fall on the first day. That none should have felt foolish marching day after day round the solid walls is beyond nature. **κυκλωθέντα,** see Josh. vi. 6, 14 and for **ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας,** Josh. vi. 14. "When applied to time, **ἐπί** denotes the period over which something extends, as Luke iv. 25, **ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία,** during three years" (Winer, p. 508). The fall of Jericho and the extermination of its inhabitants suggest the escape of Rahab. **ἡ πόρνη,** in its strict meaning ("ista meretrix" (Origen), "fornicaria" (Irenaeus), is introduced to emphasise the power of faith; she did not perish along with the disobedient (iii. 18); **ἀπειθήσασιν,** they knew that the Lord had given the land to Israel (Josh. ii. 9, 10) but did not submit themselves to the acknowledged purpose of Jehovah. Rahab acted upon her belief in this purpose and instead of delivering up the spies as enemies of her country "received them with peace," that is, as friends, risking her life because of her faith.

Vv. 32-40. Summary of the achievements of faith in the times subsequent to Joshua.

Ver. 32. At this point the writer sees that he cannot pursue the method he has been following and give in detail all the signal manifestations of faith, which are recorded in the annals of his people. **τί ἔτι λέγω,** "what shall I further say?" deliberative subjunctive (*cf.* Rom. i. 15, etc.) the writer questioning how he is to handle the numberless instances that rise before his mind. He cannot give them all, **ἐπιλείψει με γὰρ . . .** "for time will fail me if I recount in detail". (Julian, *Orat.*, i. p. 341 B. **ἐπιλείψει με τἀκείνου διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος**). **ἐπιλείψει με ἡ ἡμέρα** is frequent, see many examples in Wetstein. *Cf.* Virgil, *Æn.*, vi. 121, quid Thesea magnum, quid memorem Alciden? "a favourite device for cutting short a long list" (Page). **διηγούμενον** means to relate with particularity, see Luke viii. 39, ix. 10; Acts xii. 17; Gen. xxix. 13. On Gideon see Judges vi.-viii; Barak chronologically earlier, chap. iv, v; Samson, xiii-xvi; Jephthah, who also preceded Samson, xi, xii. Samuel is considered as the first of the prophets as in Acts iii. 24 and xiii. 20. **οὗ** covers vv. 33, 34, although not every particular cited, while **διὰ πίστεως** refers to all the verbs to end of 38. This expression supplants the persistent **πίστει** of vv. 3-31, mainly for euphony. **κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας,** "subdued kingdoms," as is recorded of the Judges and David, who also **ἠργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην,** which seems to refer to their righteous rule, although the same expression is never used in the LXX except of personal righteousness (Ps. xv. 2) but of David it is thrice said that he was **ποιῶν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην,** 2 Sam. viii. 15; 1 Chron. xviii. 14; Jer. xxiii. 5; and of Samuel testimony is borne that he judged righteously, 1 Sam. xii. 3. **ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν,** "obtained promises" not "*the* promise" of Messianic salvation (*cf.* ver. 39) but promises given on special occasions, *cf.* Josh. xxi. 45; Judges vii. 7, xiii. 5; 1 Kings viii. 56. **ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων,** *cf.* Daniel vi. 22, **ἐνέφραξε τὰ στόματα τῶν λεόντων,** also Judges xiv. 5, 6; 2 Sam. xvii. 34, xxiii. 20. **ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός,** probably the rescue of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego was suggested by the allusion to Daniel. **δύναμιν** is explained by the words of Dan. iii. 22, **ἡ κάμινος ἐξεκαύθη ἐκ περισσοῦ. ἔφυ-**

καὶ τῶν προφητῶν· 33. [z] οἳ διὰ πίστεως κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας, εἰργάσαντο[1] δικαιοσύνην, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν, ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων, 34. [a] ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός, ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας,[2] ἐνεδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ, παρεμβολὰς ἔκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων· 35. [b] ἔλαβον γυναῖκες[3] ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν· 36. [c] ἕτεροι δὲ ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων πεῖραν ἔλαβον, ἔτι δὲ δεσ-

z Judic. xiv. 6; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; 2 Sam. viii. 1, et x. 19, et xii. 29; Dan. vi. 22.
a Judic. vii. 21, et xv. 15; 1 Sam. xiv. 1, etc., et xx. 1; 1 Reg. xix. 1, etc.; 2 Reg. vi. 16, et xx. 7; 1 Par. xxii. 9; Job xlii. 10; Ps. vi. 8, et lxxxix. 20, etc.; Esa. xxxviii. 21; Dan. iii. 25.
b 1 Reg. xvii. 23; 2 Reg. iv. 36; 2 Mac. vi. 19, 28, et vii.; Acts xxii. 25.
c Jer. xx. 2.

[1] ηργασαντο in ℵ*D* 47*.
[2] μαχαιρης ℵAD*; μαχαιρας (more classical) in DᶜEKLP.
[3] γυναικας in ℵ*AD*.

γον στόματα μαχαίρης, "escaped the edge of the sword" of which there are many instances recorded, as 1 Sam. xviii. 11; 1 Kings xix. 2; 1 Mac. ii. 28. ἐδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας . . . "out of weakness became strong, waxed mighty in battle, routed the armies of aliens," having in view, possibly, the deliverance recorded in Judges iv. by Deborah, where παρεμβολή (ver. 16, etc.) is used of the army. Reference may also be made, as von Soden suggests, to the Maccabean deliverances. [παρεμβολή, 1 Macc. iii. 3, 15, 17, etc.; ἀλλοτρ. ii. 7.] On several occasions in Israel's history the three clauses received abundant illustration.

Ver. 35. ἔλαβον γυναῖκες. . . . "Women received their dead by resurrection," as is narrated of the widow of Sarepta, 1 Kings xvii. 17-24, and the Shunamite, 2 Kings iv. 34. ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν . . . "others were beaten to death". τύμπανον (sc. τύπανον from τύπ. strike) a drum, τυμπανίζω, I beat. From the expression in 2 Mac. vi. 17, 28, ἐπὶ τὸ τύμπανον, it might be supposed that some instrument more elaborate than a rod was meant and Josephus speaks of "a wheel" as being used. But that it was substantially a beating to death is proved by what is said of Eleazar (2 Mac. ii. 30), μέλλων ταῖς πληγαῖς τελευτᾶν, εἶπε. That Eleazar and the seven brethren (2 Mac. vii.) are alluded to is obvious, for it was characteristic of them that they died οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, not accepting the offered deliverance. Eleazar was shown a way by which he could escape death (2 Mac. vi. 21), and the seven brethren also were first interrogated and would have escaped death had they chosen to eat polluted food. They endured martyrdom, not accepting the escape that was possible, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν, "that they might obtain a better resurrection," "unto eternal life—'better' than that spoken of in the beginning of the verse, to a life that again ended" (Davidson, Weiss, von Soden). How fully the resurrection was in view of the seven brethren is shown in the saying of the second: "the King of the world shall raise us εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς; of the third who when his hands were cut off declared that he would receive them again from God; of the fourth, who in dying said, "It is good, when put to death by men, to look for hope from God to be raised up again by Him;" and the youngest said of them all, "they are dead under God's covenant of everlasting life".

Ver. 36. ἕτεροι δὲ . . . introducing a different class of victories achieved by faith, although ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων, "mockings and scourgings" were endured by the martyrs who have just been mentioned (2 Mac. vii. 7 and vii. 1). πεῖραν ἔλαβον, see ver. 29. ἔτι δὲ δεσμῶν . . . "yea, moreover of bonds and prison"; as the examples in Bleek prove, ἔτι δὲ is commonly used to express a climax (*cf.* Luke xiv. 26); and such imprisonment as was inflicted, *e.g.*, on Jeremiah (xxxviii. 9) was certainly even more to be dreaded than scourging. ἐλιθάσθησαν, "they were stoned," as was Zechariah, son of Johoiada, 2 Chron. xxiv. 20 (Luke xi. 51). There was also a tradition that Jeremiah was stoned at Daphne in Egypt. ἐπρίσθησαν, "they were sawn asunder," a cruel death some-

d 1 Reg. xxi. 13; 2 Reg. i. 8; Matt. iii. 4.

μῶν καὶ φυλακῆς· 37. [d] ἐλιθάσθησαν, ἐπρίσθησαν, ἐπειράσθησαν,[1] ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον· περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν, ὑστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακουχούμενοι· 38. ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος· ἐν ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι καὶ ὄρεσι καὶ σπηλαίοις

e ver. 2.

καὶ ταῖς ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς. 39. [e] Καὶ οὗτοι πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως, οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, 40. τοῦ Θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν κρεῖττόν τι προβλεψαμένου, ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσι.

[1] T.R. in ADcEK d, e, f, vg., Copt., Arm. In other MSS. the order varies. "Possibly **ἐπειράσθησαν** is only a reduplication of **ἐπρίσθησαν** . . . but it may with at least equal probability be a primitive corruption of some other word" (Hort).

times inflicted on prisoners of war (2 Sam. xii. 31; Amos i. 3, **ἔπριζον πρίοσι σιδηροῖς**). The reference is probably to Isaiah who according to the *Ascensio Is.* (i. 9, v. 1) was sawn asunder by Manasseh with a wooden saw. *Cf.* Justin, *Trypho*, 120, (**πρίονι ξυλίνῳ ἐπρίσατε**) and Charles' *Ascension of Isaiah*. Within our own memory some of the followers of the Bâb suffered the same death. **ἐπειράσθησαν,** "were tempted". Alford says, "I do not see how any appropriate meaning can be given to the mere enduring of temptation, placed as it is between being sawn asunder and dying by the sword". He would therefore either omit the word as a gloss on **ἐπρίσθησαν** or substitute **ἐπρήσθησαν.** That is a tempting reading because not only was one of the seven brothers (2 Mac. vi. vii. 5) fried, but those who sought to keep the Sabbath in a cave (2 Mac. vi. 11) were all burned together by order of Philip, Antiochus' governor in Jerusalem. At the same time, the reading, "were tempted" gives quite a good sense, for certainly the most fiendish element in the torture of the seven brothers was the pressure put on each individually to recant. **ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρης ἀπέθανον,** "died by sword-slaughter," for **ἐν φ. μαχ.** see Exod. xvii. 13; Num. xxi. 24, etc.; and for **ἀπεθ. ἐν** see Jer. xi. 22. xxi. 9. Examples of this death abounded in the Maccabean period. **περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς,** "they wandered about in sheepskins," (as the mantle of Elijah is called in 2 Kings ii. 8, **ἔλαβεν Ἠλιοὺ τὴν μηλωτὴν αὐτοῦ**), or even "in goatskins," a still rougher material. This dress they wore not as a professional uniform, but because "destitute," **ὑστερούμενοι** as in Luke xv. 14. **ἤρξατο ὑστερεῖσθαι,** Phil. iv. 12 **καὶ περισσεύειν καὶ ὑστερεῖσθαι,** "hard-pressed," **θλιβόμενοι,** as in 2 Cor. iv. 8 **θλιβόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι, κακουχούμενοι,** "maltreated," see ver. 25. **ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος,** "of whom the world was not worthy". "The world drove them out, thinking them unworthy to live in it, while in truth it was unworthy to have them living in it" (Davidson). Vaughan aptly compares Acts xxii. 22. After this parenthetical remark the description is closed with another participial clause, **ἐπὶ ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι . . .** "wandering over deserts and mountains, and in caves and in the holes of the earth," verified 1 Kings xviii. 4; 2 Macc. v. 27 where it is related of Judas and nine others, **ἀναχωρήσας εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, θηρίων τρόπον ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι διέζη.** *Cf.* also 2 Mac. x. 6, **ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις θηρίων τρόπον ἦσαν νεμόμενοι.** In the *Ascensio Isaiae*, ii. 7, 12, Isaiah and his companions are said to have spent two years among the mountains naked and eating only herbage.

Ver. 39. **καὶ οὗτοι πάντες,** "And these all," that is, those who have been named in this chapter, "although they had witness borne to them through their faith," as has been recorded (ver. 2-38), "did not receive the promise," that is, as already said in ver. 13, they only foresaw that it would be fulfilled and died in that faith. But this failure to obtain the fulfilment of the promise was not due to any slackness on the part of God nor to any defect in their faith; there was a good reason for it, and that reason was that "God had in view some better thing for us, that without us they should not be perfected". The **κρεῖττόν τι** is that which this Epistle has made it its business to expound, the perfecting (**τελειωθῶσιν**) of God's people by full communion with Him mediated by the perfect revelation (i. 1) of the Son and His perfect covenant (viii. 7-13), and His better sacrifice (ix. 23). And the perfecting of the people of God under the O.T. is said to have been impossible, not as might have

XII. 1. [a] **ΤΟΙΓΑΡΟΥΝ καὶ ἡμεῖς τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων, ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον**

[a] x. 36; Rom. vi. 4, et xii. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 24; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Eph. iv. 22; Phil. iii. 13, 14; Col. iii. 8; 1 Peter ii. 1, et iv. 2.

been expected "apart from the Son," but **χωρὶς ἡμῶν**, because the writer has in view the history of the Church, the relation of the people of God in former times to the same people in Messianic times.

CHAPTER XII.—Ver. 1. **Τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς. . . .** "Wherefore, as we have so great a cloud of witnesses encompassing us, let us likewise lay aside every encumbrance and sin that clings so close and run with endurance the race that is set before us, looking to the leader and perfecter of faith, even Jesus, who for the joy set before him endured a cross despising shame and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." **τοιγαροῦν**, "wherefore then" more formal and emphatic than the usual, **διὰ τοῦτο, διὸ, ὅθεν, οὖν. καὶ ἡμεῖς**, we in our turn, we as well as they, and with the added advantage of having so many testimonies to the good results of faith. **νέφος** used frequently in Homer and elsewhere, as "nubes" in Latin and "cloud" in English to suggest a vast multitude. **μαρτύρων**, "witnesses," persons who by their actions have testified to the worth of faith. The cloud of witnesses are those named and suggested in chap. xi.; persons whose lives witnessed to the work and triumph of faith, and whose faith was witnessed to by Scripture, *cf.* xi. 2, 4, 5. This cloud is **περικείμενον**, because, as the writer has just shown, look where they will into their history his Hebrew readers see such examples of faith. It is impossible to take **μάρτυρες** as equivalent to **θεαταί**. If the idea of "spectator" is present at all, which is very doubtful, it is only introduced by the words **τρέχωμεν . . . ἀγῶνα**. The idea is not that they are running in presence of spectators and must therefore run well; but that their people's history being filled with examples of much-enduring but triumphant faith, they also must approve their lineage by showing a like persistence of faith. **ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα, ὄγκος**, a mass or weight or burden (= **φόρτος**), hence a swelling or superfluous flesh [*cf.* especially Longinus, iii. 9, **κακοὶ δὲ ὄγκοι καὶ ἐπὶ σωμάτων καὶ λόγων.** and from Hippocrates in Wetstein, **καὶ γὰρ δρόμοι ταχεῖς, καὶ γυμνάσια τοιαῦτα, σαρκῶν ὄγκον καθαίρει.**] The allusion therefore is to the training preparatory to a race by which an encumbering superfluity of flesh is reduced. The Christian runner must rid himself even of innocent things which might retard him. And all that does not help, hinders. It is by running he learns what these things are. So long as he stands he does not feel that they are burdensome and hampering. **καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν.** Of the difficult word **εὐπερ.** Chrysostom gives two interpretations; "which is easily avoided," and "which easily encompasses or surrounds us". In the sense of "avoid" the verb **περιϊστάσθαι** occurs in 2 Tim. ii. 16 and Tit. iii. 9, but it is scarcely credible that in the present context such an epithet could be applied to sin. The second interpretation has been generally accepted ["circumstans nos peccatum" (Vulg.); "qui nous enveloppe si aisément"; "die Sünde, die immer zur Hand ist" (Weizsäcker)]. This meaning suits the context and the action enjoined in **ἀποθέμενοι**, suggesting, as it does, the trailing garment that encumbers the runner. The article **τὴν** does not point to some particular sin, but to that which characterises all sin, the tenacity with which it clings to a man. We might suppose from the word itself that it alluded to sin as an enemy encompassing from well-chosen points of vantage, but this does not suit the figure of the race nor the **ἀποθέμενοι.** [Porphyry, *de Abstin.*, says **γυμνοὶ δὲ καὶ ἀχίτωνες ἐπὶ τὸ στάδιον ἀναβαίνωμεν ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς Ὀλύμπια ἀγωνισόμενοι.** "Ut cursores vestimenta non solum abjiciunt, nudique currunt, verum etiam crebris exercitationibus, ne corpus nimis obesum et ineptum reddatur, efficiunt: ita et vos omnia impedimenta in studio virtutis, et tarditatem vestram crebris meditationibus vincite" (Wetstein).] **δι' ὑπομονῆς**, after the negative preparation comes the positive demand for endurance, *cf.* x. 36. **τρέχωμεν . . . ἀγῶνα**, as in Herod. viii. 102, **πολλοὺς ἀγῶνας δραμέονται οἱ Ἕλληνες. προκείμενον**, [frequent with **ἀγών**, as in Arrian's *Epict.*, iii. 25, **οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πάλης καὶ παγκρατίου ὁ ἀγὼν πρόκειται.** *Cf. Orestes of* Eurip., 845, and Ignatius to *Eph.*, c. 17. **τοῦ προκειμένου ζῆν.**] appointed, lying before us as our destined

b i. 3, 13, et ii. 10, et viii. 1; Luc. xxiv. 26, 46; Acts iii. 15, et v. 31; Phil. ii. 8, etc.; 1 Peter i. 3.

ἁμαρτίαν, δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα· 2. [b] ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν, ὃς ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς, ὑπέμεινε σταυρόν, αἰσχύνης κατα-

c 1 Cor. x. 13.

φρονήσας, ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκάθισεν.[1] 3. ἀναλογί-σασθε γὰρ τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς αὐτὸν[2] ἀντιλογίαν, ἵνα μὴ κάμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι.

4. [c] Οὔπω μέχρις αἵματος ἀντικατέστητε πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν

[1] κεκαθικεν in ℵADEKLP.

[2] εις εαυτον AP Vulg.; εις εαυτους ℵ*D*E*. ["Looks like the conceit which some reader wrote upon his margin" (Davidson).]

trial. This let us run, not waiting for a pleasanter, easier course, but accepting that which is appointed and recognising the difficulties as constituent parts of the race. Success depends on the condition attached **ἀφορῶντες . . . Ἰησοῦν,** fixing our gaze on Him who sets us the example (**ἀρχηγόν**) of faith, and exhibits it in its perfect form (**τελειωτής**), who leads us in faith and in whom faith finds its perfect embodiment. **ἀρχηγός** properly means one to whom anything owes its origin (*cf.* ii. 10), but here it rather indicates one who takes the lead or sets the example most worth following. Jesus is the **ἀρχηγὸς τῆς πίστεως** because he is its **τελειωτής.** In Him alone do we see absolute dependence on God, implicit trust, what it is, what it costs, and what it results in. (Hence the human name **Ἰησοῦν.**) On Him therefore must the gaze be fixed if the runner is to endure, for in Him the reasonableness, the beauty, and the reward of a life of faith are seen. Faith manifested itself in Jesus, especially in His endurance of the cross in virtue of His faith in the resulting joy beyond. **ὃς ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς . . . ἀντί** here as in ver. 16 denotes the price paid, or reward offered, "in consideration of". There was a joy set before Jesus, which nerved Him to endure. This joy was the sitting in the place of achieved victory and power, not a selfish joy, but the consciousness of salvation wrought for men, of power won which he could use in their interests. This hope or confident expectation so animated Him that He endured the utmost of human suffering and shame. The shame is mentioned **αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας,** because His despising of it manifests a mind fixed on the glory that was to follow and filled with it.

Ver. 3. **ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ. . . .** The reason for fixing the gaze on Jesus is given. That reason being found in the **τοιαύτην.** This so great contumely and opposition endured by Jesus the Hebrews are to consider, "to bring into analogy, think of by comparing" with their own and so renew their hopeful endurance. **τὸν . . . ἀντιλογίαν,** "Him who has endured at the hands of sinners such contradiction against Himself." The desire on the part of several interpreters to put a stronger meaning into **ἀντιλογία** —although quite unsupported by usage— reveals a feeling that verbal abuse or contradiction was a much less severe trial than such as are enumerated in chap. xi. But not only was it this **ἀντιλογία** which brought Christ to the cross and formed the **αἰσχύνη** of it, but it was the repudiation of His claims throughout His life which formed the chief element in His trial. It was predicted (Luke ii. 34) that He would be a **σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον,** full of significance misinterpreted, full of God rejected. It was precisely this general rejection and contempt from which the Hebrews were themselves suffering. They were finding how hard it was to maintain a solitary faith contradicted and scorned by public sentiment. Think then, says this writer, of Him who has endured at the hands of sinners so much more painful contradiction "against Himself". **ἵνα μὴ κάμητε . . .** "that ye wax not weary, fainting in your souls". **ψυχαῖς** may be construed either with **κάμητε** or with **ἐκλυόμενοι**; better with the latter. [Polybius, xx. 4, 7, speaking of the demoralisation of the Boeotians says that giving themselves up to eating and drinking, **οὐ μόνον τοῖς σώμασιν ἐξελύθησαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς.**]

Ver. 4. **Οὔπω μέχρις αἵματος. . . .** "Not yet unto blood have ye resisted in your contest with sin." Bengel says: "a cursu venit ad pugilatum". *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 24-27. But this is doubtful.

ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι, 5. [d] καὶ ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως, ἥτις ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς διαλέγεται· "Υἱέ μου, μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας Κυρίου, μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος. 6. ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος παιδεύει· μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται." 7. Εἰ[1] παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, ὡς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ Θεός· τίς γάρ ἐστιν

d Job v. 17; Prov. iii. 11, 12; Apoc. iii. 19.

[1] ει in minusculis; εις in ℵADKLP, Vulg.

μέχρις αἵματος [Theoph., ἄχρι θανάτου, *cf.* Rev. xii. 11.] Does this mean, Ye have not yet become a martyr church, suffering death in Christ's cause; or does it mean, Ye have not yet resisted sin in deadly earnest? The interpretation is determined by the connection. Jesus endured the ἀντιλογία of sinners even to blood, the death of the cross; the Hebrews have not yet been called so to suffer in their conflict, a conflict which every day summons them to fresh resistance against the sin of failure of faith and apostasy. "'Sin' is not here put for sinners, nor is it sin in their persecutors; it is sin in themselves, the sin of unbelief, which is here regarded as their true antagonist, though of course the excesses of their persecutors gave it its power against them" (Davidson and Weiss).

Vv. 5-17. The Hebrews are reminded that their sufferings are tokens of God's fatherly love and care.

Ver. 5. καὶ ἐκλέλησθε. . . . "And ye have clean forgotten the exhortation, which speaks to you as to sons, My Son, etc.". καὶ introduces a fresh consideration. Calvin, Bleek and others treat the clause as an interrogation, needlessly. The παράκλησις is cited from Prov. iii. 11, and includes vv. 5 and 6. The only divergence from the LXX is the insertion of μου after υἱέ. But Bleek calls attention to the fact that the Hebrew of the last clause stands, according to the present punctuation, וּכְאָב אֶת־בֵּן יְרָצֶה = and as a father the son in whom he delights. The LXX instead of כְּאָב have read כֵּאֵב the Piel of כָּאַב to feel pain, and so to cause pain; certainly a better sense. In the Book of Proverbs the speaker identifies himself with wisdom, and here the words are justifiably viewed as Divine. ὀλιγώρει is classical, meaning "make light of," "neglect," "despise". παιδεία is discipline, or correction, or the entire training and education of childhood and youth. And it is here urged that by the trials and difficulties of life God trains His children; that to view sufferings in separation from God and to be oblivious of God's design in them is disastrous; and that despondency and failure of faith under suffering are inappropriate, for trials are not evidence of God's displeasure, but on the contrary tokens of His love, the uniform discipline to which every son must be subjected, ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ . . . the emphasis falling on ἀγαπᾷ. ὃν παραδέχεται, "whom He takes to Him as a veritable son, receives in his heart and cherishes" (Alford). The word is similarly used in Polybius, xxxviii. 1, 8. [The same passage from Proverbs is cited by Philo (De Cong. Erud. gratia, p 544) who adds, οὕτως ἄρα ἡ ἐπίπληξις καὶ νουθεσία καλὸν νενόμισται, ὥστε δι' αὐτῆς ἡ πρὸς θεὸν ὁμολογία συγγένεια γίνεται· τί γὰρ οἰκειότερον υἱῷ πατρὸς ἢ υἱοῦ πατρί; *Cf.* Menander's ὁ μὴ δαρεὶς ἄνθρωπος οὐ παιδεύεται, and Seneca's *De Providentia* where the same comparison is elaborated, and the great principle laid down "non quid, sed quemadmodum feras, interest".]

Ver. 7. The inference from the passage cited is obvious, εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, "it is for training ye are enduring (are called to endure), as sons God is dealing with you". [προσφέρεται is common; as in Xenophon, οὐ γὰρ ὡς φίλοι προσεφέροντο ἡμῖν; and in Josephus, ὡς πολεμίοις προσεφέροντο.] Their sufferings are evidence that God considers them His sons and treats them as such; for what son is there whom his father does not correct? τίς γὰρ υἱὸς . . . similar in form to Matt. vii. 9, τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος;—εἰ δὲ χωρίς. . . . Whereas did they receive no such treatment, were they free from that discipline of which all (God's children) have become partakers (as illustrated in chap. xi.) then in this case they are bastards and not sons; their freedom from the discipline which God uniformly accords His children would prove that they were not genuine sons.

υἱὸς ὃν οὐ παιδεύει πατήρ; 8. εἰ δὲ χωρίς ἐστε παιδείας, ἧς
e Num. xvi. 22, et xxvii. 16; Eccl. xii. 1, 7; Esa. lvii. 16, Zach. xii. 1. μέτοχοι γεγόνασι πάντες, ἄρα νόθοι ἐστὲ καὶ οὐχ υἱοί. 9. ᵉεἶτα τοὺς μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας εἴχομεν παιδευτὰς, καὶ ἐνετρε-
πόμεθα· οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα, τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων,
καὶ ζήσομεν; 10. οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν
αὐτοῖς, ἐπαίδευον· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς
ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ. 11. πᾶσα δὲ[1] παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν οὐ
δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι, ἀλλὰ λύπης· ὕστερον δὲ καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς

[1] WH read μεν with ℵ*P, 17, 21, d; δε is found in ℵᶜADᶜKL, f, Vulg., etc. ["None of the particles are satisfactory, though δέ was sure to be introduced" (Hort).]

Ver. 9. With **εἶτα** a fresh phase of the argument is introduced. [Raphel *in loc.* is of opinion that **εἶτα** here as frequently in the classics is "nota interrogantis cum vehementia et quasi indignatione quadam"; but it gives a better construction if we take it in the sense of "further" as in 1 Cor. xii. 5, 7, and Mark iv. 28, **πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτα στάχυν, εἶτα πλήρης σῖτος.**] The argument is, "the fathers of our flesh we used to have as trainers, and we had them in reverence; shall we not much rather be subject to the Father of our spirits and live?" The article before **πνευμάτων** makes it probable that there is no reference to angels but only an antithesis to **τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν.** The position of the two words **σαρκός** and **πνευμάτων** confirms this. **καὶ ζήσομεν** is unexpected, and is inserted to balance **καὶ ἐνετρεπόμεθα** [on this verb see Anz. p. 269] in the rhythm of the sentence. The thought is that only by subjection to the Father of our spirit can we have life. Delitzsch maintains that this verse strongly favours the theory of Creationism and quotes Hugo de S. Victore, "Nota diligenter hanc authoritatem, per quam manifeste probatur, quod animae non sunt ex traduce sicut caro". It is safer to say with Davidson, "It is as a spirit, or on his spiritual side, that man enters into close relation with God; and this leads to the conception that God is more especially the Author of man's spirit, or Author of man on his spiritual side, and to designations such as those in Num. xvi. 22". Modern science scouts Creationism; although if Wallace's idea of the evolution of man be accepted it might find encouragement.

Ver. 10. **οἱ μὲν γὰρ. . . .** The reasonableness of the appeal of ver. 9 is further illustrated by a comparison of the character and end in the earthly and heavenly fathers' discipline respectively. The earthly fathers exercised discipline for a few days in accordance with what commended itself to their judgment as proper; a judgment which could not be infallible and must sometimes have hindered rather than helped true growth; but the heavenly Father uses discipline with a view to our profit that we may partake of his holiness. Two notes of imperfection characterise the discipline of the fathers of our flesh. (1) It is **πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας,** "for a few days," *i.e.*, during the brief period of youth. It must cease when manhood is attained, whether or not it has attained its end. (2) It is **κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς,** subject to misconception both of the end to be reached and the means by which it can be attained. In contrast to this second feature the discipline of the Father of our spirit is without fail **ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον,** "for our advantage," which is defined in **εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ,** "that we may partake of His holiness," in which the contrast to the incomplete

Ver. 11. **πᾶσα δὲ παιδεία. . . .** Another encouragement to endure chastening: if it is allowed to do its work righteousness will result. "Now all chastisement for the present indeed seems matter not of joy but of grief, afterwards however it yields, to those who are disciplined by it, the peaceable fruit of righteousness". [**πᾶσα,** as Chrys. says, **τουτέστι καὶ ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη καὶ ἡ πνευματική.**] **πρὸς τὸ παρόν,** see Thucyd., ii. 22. **οὐ δοκεῖ. . . λύπης,** Chrys. **καλῶς εἶπεν· οὐ δοκεῖ. οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστι λύπης ἡ παιδεία, ἀλλὰ μόνον δοκεῖ,** see Bleek. Chastisement is here viewed as an opportunity for cultivating faith and endurance and to those who use the opportunity and are exercised and trained by it, **δι' αὐτῆς**

διʼ αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδίδωσι δικαιοσύνης. 12. [f]Διὸ "τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε" · 13. [g]καὶ "τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε [1] τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν," ἵνα μὴ τὸ χωλὸν ἐκτραπῇ, ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον. 14. [f]Εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων, καὶ [h]τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν Κύριον · 15. [h]ἐπισκοποῦν-

[f] Esa. xxxv. 3.
[g] Matt. v. 8; Rom. xii. 28; 2 Tim. ii. 22.
[h] iii. 12; Deut. xxix. 18; Acts xvii. 13; 2 Cor. vi.; 1 Gal. v. 12.

[1] ποιησατε in ℵcADKL ; ποιειτε in ℵ*P, 17.

γεγυμνασμένοις, it necessarily yields, renders as the harvest due, ἀποδίδωσιν, as its fruit increased righteousness of life. But why "peaceful" εἰρηνικὸν? Probably because the result of the conflict (γεγυμνασμένοις) and victory is peace in God and peace of conscience. It is a peace which can only be attained by those who have used their trials as a discipline and have emerged victorious from the conflict.

Ver. 12. διὸ τὰς παρειμένας . . . "Wherefore" introducing the immediate application of this encouraging view of trials, "lift up" to renew the conflict, "the nerveless hands" fallen to your side and "the paralysed knees". ἀνορθώσατε seems at first sight more appropriate to χεῖρας than to γόνατα (Vaughan) but it is here used in the general sense of "restore," "renew the life of"; as in Soph., *O.T.*, 46-51, ἀσφαλείᾳ τήνδʼ ἀνόρθωσον πόλιν. It might be rendered "revive". Probably the writer had in his mind Isa. xxxv. 3, ἰσχύσατε, χεῖρες ἀνειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα. In Sir. xxv. 23 the woman that does not increase the happiness of her husband is χεῖρες παρειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα, in other words, makes him despair and cease from all effort. So here, the hands hang down in listless consciousness of defeat. καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς . . . "and make straight paths for your feet, that that which is lame be not turned out of the way but rather be healed". The words are quoted from Prov. iv. 26, ὀρθὰς τροχιὰς ποίει σοῖς ποσί, and if ποιήσατε is retained they form a hexameter line. The whole verse forms an admonition to the healthier portion of the church to make no deviation from the straight course set before them by the example of Christ, and thus they would offer no temptation to the weaker members [τὸ χωλὸν, the lame and limping] to be turned quite out of the way, but would rather be an encouragement to them and so afford them an opportunity of being healed of their infirmity. [A number of interpreters take ἐκτραπῇ in the sense of "dislocated". Thus Davidson, "The words 'turned out of the way' mean in medical writers 'dislocated,' and this gives a more vigorous sense and forms a better opposition to 'be healed'. Inconsistency and vacillation in the general body of the church would create a way so difficult for the lame, that their lameness would become dislocation, and they would perish from the way; on the other hand, the habit of going in a plain path would restore them to soundness." This is inviting, but there is much against it. (1) The medical use of ἐκτρέπομαι is rare (see Stephanus) and not likely to occur here. (2) When used in a general sense ἰαθῇ is an appropriate antithesis; thus in Niceph. Call. (see Stephanus) occur the words Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Ἱεροσολύμων πατριάρχῃ τὴν ἀκοὴν ἐκτραπεῖσαν ἰᾶται. (3) The passage in Proverbs from which the former part of the verse is cited goes on thus: "Turn not aside to the right hand nor to the left".] Immediately after these words follows a clause which guides to the interpretation of εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων, "God will make thy ways straight and will guide thy goings in peace"; and a considerable part of the counsels given in the context in Proverbs concerns the maintenance of peaceful relations with others. The circumstances of the Hebrews were fitted to excite a quarrelsome spirit, and a feeling of alienation towards those weak members who left the straight path. They must not suffer them to be alienated but must restore them to the unity of the faith, and in endeavouring to reclaim them must use the methods of peace not of anger or disputation. καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν . . . "and the consecration without which no one shall see the Lord". The ἁγιασμός which this Epistle has explained is a drawing near to God with cleansed conscience (x. 14, 22), a true acceptance of Christ's sacrifice as bringing the worshipper into fellowship with God.

Ver. 15. ἐπισκοποῦντες μή

τες μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ· μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας
i Gen. xxv. 33; Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 3. ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ, καὶ διὰ ταύτης[1] μιανθῶσι πολλοί[2]· 16. [i]μή τις πόρνος, ἢ βέβηλος, ὡς Ἠσαῦ, ὃς ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς ἀπέδοτο[3] τὰ
k Gen. xxvii. 34, etc. πρωτοτόκια αὐτοῦ. 17. [k]ἴστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρο-

[1] T.R. in ℵDKL; δι' αυτης AP, 17, 47.
[2] T.R. in DKLP; οι πολλοι in ℵA, 17, 47.
[3] T.R. ℵDKLP, 17; απεδετο AC.

τις ὑστερῶν . . . "watching" "taking the oversight" (thoroughly scrutinising as in the case of sick persons," Chrys.) addressed not to the teachers or rulers but to all. The object of this supervision is to prevent the defection of any one of their number. "As if they were travelling together on some long journey, in a large company, he says, Take heed that no man be left behind; I do not seek this only, that ye may arrive yourselves, but also that ye should look diligently after the others" (Chrys.), and *cf.* M. Arnold's *In Rugby Chapel.* μή τις ὑστερῶν . . . may be construed either by supplying ᾖ, or by supposing a break at θεοῦ (so Davidson), or by carrying on the τις ὑστερῶν to ἐνοχλῇ. The simplest seems to be the first: "lest any be failing (= fail) of the grace of God," *i.e.*, lest he never reach the blessings which the grace of God offers. *Cf.* iv. 1. Another contingency to be guarded against by careful watching is expressed in μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας . . . words borrowed from Deut. xxix. 18, μή τίς ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ, "lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you". As in Deuteronomy so here the bitter root which might spring up and bring forth its poisonous fruit among them, was one of their own members who might lead them astray or introduce evil practises and so the whole community [οἱ πολλοί] might be defiled [μιανθῶσιν], *i.e.*, rendered unfit for that approach to God and fellowship with Him to which they were urged in the preceding verse. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, Gal. v. 9, where also it is a person that is referred to.

Ver. 16. μή τις πόρνος . . . specific forms in which roots of bitterness might appear among them. πόρνος is to be taken in its literal sense and not as signifying departure from God [but *cf.* Weiss]. Neither is it to be applied to Esau, in spite of the passages adduced by Wetstein to show that he was commonly considered a fornicator, and of Philo's interpretation of "hairy" as "intemperate and libidinous"; v. Delitzsch. From xiii. 4 it appears that fornication was one of the dangers to which these Hebrews were exposed. ἢ βέβηλος ὡς Ἠσαῦ, a profanity which was especially betrayed in his bartering for a single meal [ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς] his own rights of primogeniture. Esau lightly parting with his religious privileges and his patrimony for a present gratification is an appropriate warning to those who day by day were tempted to win comfort and escape suffering by parting with their hope in Christ. The warning is pointed by the fate of Esau. ἴστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα . . . "for ye know that even though he was afterwards desirous to inherit the blessing he was rejected, though he sought it with tears; for he found no place of repentance". "The term 'repentance' is here used not strictly of mere change of mind, but of a change of mind undoing the effects of a former state of mind" (Davidson). In other words, his bargain was irrevocable. The words must be interpreted by the narrative in Genesis (xxvii. 1-41), where we read that some time after the sale of the birthright (μετέπειτα) Esau sought the blessing with tears (xxvii. 38, ἀνεβόησε φωνῇ Ἠσαῦ καὶ ἔκλαυσεν) but found his act was unalterable. The lesson written on Esau's life as on that of all who miss opportunities is that the past is irreparable, and however much they may desire to recall and alter it, that cannot be. It was this which the writer wished to enforce. If now, through any temptation or pressure, you let go the benefits you have in Christ, you are committing yourselves to an act you cannot recall. It must also be observed that the author is confining his attention to the one act of Esau, not pronouncing on his whole life and ultimate destiny. [μετανοίας τόπον. So Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 97, "poenitentiae locus;" and Ulpian, *Digest.*, xl. Tit. 7, "poenitentiae haeredis is locum non esse" (Wetstein)].

νομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν, ἀπεδοκιμάσθη· μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρε, καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν. l Exod. xix. 10, etc., et xx. 19; Deut. v. 22.

18. [1]Οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει,[1] καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ, καὶ γνόφῳ, καὶ σκότῳ, καὶ θυέλλῃ, 19. [m]καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ, καὶ φωνῇ ῥημάτων, ἧς οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρῃτήσαντο μὴ προστεθῆναι m Exod. xx. 19; Deut. v. 5, 24, et xviii. 16.

[1] T.R. Dgr KL, 37, 116; omit ορει ℵAC, 17, 47, f, Vulg., Cod., Opt., Syr. Pesch.

Vv. 18-29. In this paragraph we have the climax of the Epistle. Its doctrine and its exhortation alike culminate here. The great aim of the writer has been to persuade the Hebrews to hearken to the word spoken by God in Christ (i. 1, ii. 1-4). This aim he still seeks to attain by bringing before his readers in one closing picture the contrast between the old dispensation and the new. The old was characterised by material, sensible transitory manifestations; the new by what is supersensible and eternally stable. The old also rather emphasised the inaccessible nature of God, His unapproachable holiness, His awful majesty, and taught men that they could not come near; the new brings men into the very presence of God, and though He be "Judge of all" yet is He surrounded with the spirits of perfected men. But as the writer seeks to quicken his readers to a more zealous faith He shows also the awful consequences of refusing Him that speaketh from heaven. Not the fire and smoke of Sinai threaten now to consume the disobedient, but "our God is a consuming fire"; not a symbolic and material element threatened, but the very Eternal and All-pervading Himself. And, returning to the idea with which he commenced the Epistle and so making its unity obvious, the writer contrasts the voice that shook the earth with the infinitely more terrible voice that shakes the heavens also, that terminates time and brings in eternal things.

Ver. 18. **Οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε . . .** "For ye have not approached," assigning a further reason for the previous exhortation. Your fathers drew near [Deut. iv. 11, **προσήλθετε καὶ ἔστητε ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος**] to hear God's word. The word is used in its general sense, and the idea of drawing near as an accepted worshipper is not intended. **ψηλαφωμένῳ . . .** As MS. authority removes **ὄρει**, the construction is doubtful. The R.V. renders "*the mount* that might be touched," indicating that "the mount" is not in the text. This is justified by the antithetic clause, ver. 22, **ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει**, which already was in his mind. Others translate "ye are not come to a palpable and kindled fire," which is grammatically possible, but open to the objection that "a palpable fire," a fire that can be touched is precisely what this fire was not, and it is an awkward mode of expressing a "material" fire. A third rendering is "Ye are not come to that which can be touched and is kindled with fire". **κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ**, "that burned with fire" is in agreement with Deut. iv. 11, **τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυρὶ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· σκότος, γνόφος, θύελλα**; see also Deut. v. 22, 23, ix. 15; Exod. xix. 18. The "gloom and mist and tempest (or hurricane) and the blast of trumpet (Exod. xix. 16, **φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἦχει μέγα**) and voice of words" (Deut. iv. 12, **ἐλάλησε Κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρὸς φωνὴν ῥημάτων**) are enumerated to accentuate the material and terrifying character of the revelation on which the O.T. dispensation was founded. The regularly recurrent **καὶ** gives emphasis to this enumeration; all the features of the manifestation were of the same character. The article is omitted before each particular, because each is introduced not for its own sake but for the general effect. From **ἧς** to **ἔντρομος** (ver. 21) describes the terror induced by these manifestations, (1) first in the people (**οἱ ἀκούσαντες**) who begged that not a word more should be added to them (**προστεθῆναι** suggested by Deut. v. 25 and xviii. 16, **οὐ προσθήσομεν ἀκοῦσαι τὴν φωνὴν Κύριου**, "we will not any more hear, etc.,") for they could not endure that which was being commanded, "If even a beast touch the mountain it shall be stoned" (Exod. xix. 12, 13); and (2) also in Moses, for, so terrifying was the appearance that Moses said, "I am extremely afraid (Deut. ix. 9) and tremble". (**ἔκφοβός εἰμι** was uttered by Moses when God's anger was roused by the people's idolatry; Stephen (Acts vii. 32) uses **ἔντρομος γενόμενος** of Moses at the burning bush.)

n Exod. xix. 13. αὐτοῖς λόγον· 20. [n] οὐκ ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ διαστελλόμενον, "Κἂν θηρίον θίγῃ τοῦ ὄρους, λιθοβοληθήσεται, ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται[1]".

o Gal. iv. 26; Apoc. iii. 12, et xxi. 2, 10. 21. καὶ, οὕτω φοβερὸν ἦν τὸ φανταζόμενον, Μωσῆς εἶπεν, "[o] Ἔκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἔντρομος·" 22. [o] ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει, καὶ πόλει

[1] This clause occurs in none of the uncials—the sole authority is "nonnulli minusculi".

Ver. 22. The Christian standing and attainment are now described in contrast with the Jewish. Ye are brought into the fellowship of eternal realities. **ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε,** "but ye have drawn near" (already you have entered into your eternal relation to the unseen) to **Σιὼν ὄρει,** "in the twenty-three passages in the LXX where the two words are combined the order is uniformly **ὄρος Σιὼν** and not **Σιὼν ὄρος.** Evidently here the '*Zion mountain*' is mentally contrasted with another, the '*Sinai mountain*'. And thus the omission of **ὄρει** in the revised text of ver. 18 is virtually supplied" (Vaughan). The ideal Zion is the place of God's manifestation of His presence (Ps. ix. 11, lxxvi. 2) but also of His people's abode (Ps. cxlvi. 10; Isa. i. 27 and *passim*). It is therefore impossible to find another particular of the enumeration in **πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ,** as if the former were "the transcendent sphere of God's existence where He is manifested only to Himself," and the latter "the place where His people gather and where He is manifested to them". (*Cf.* Isa. lx. 14, **κληθήσῃ πόλις Κυρίου, Σιών**); the mount and the city are viewed together as the meeting-place of God and His people, where the "living God" manifests fully His eternal fulness and sufficiency. It is "the heavenly Jerusalem" (*cf.* Gal. iv. 26, **ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ** and Rev. xxi. 2, **ἡ πόλις ἡ μέλλουσα [καὶ μένουσα]**, xiii. 14) as being not the earthly and made with hands but the ultimate reality [*cf.* the beautiful description in Philo, *De Som.*, ii. 38, and the *Republic*, ix. p. 592, where after declaring that no such city as he has been describing exists on earth Plato goes on to say, **Ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἴσως παράδειγμα ἀνάκειται τῷ βουλομένῳ ὁρᾶν καὶ ὁρῶντι ἑαυτὸν κατοικίζειν.** Also the fine passage in Seneca, *De Otio*, chap. 31, on the two Republics.] **καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων,** and to myriads of angels, the usual accompaniment of God's glory and ministers of His will, as in Deut. xxxii. 2; Rev. v. 11; and Dan. vii. 10, **μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ.** The construction of the following words is much debated. (1) **πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησ.** may be construed in apposition with **μυρ. ἀγγέλων,** to myriads of angels, a festal gathering and assembly of the first-born enrolled in heaven; or, (2) a new particular may be introduced with **καὶ ἐκκλησ.**; or, (3) a new particular may be introduced with **πανηγύρει,** "to myriads of angels, to a festal gathering and assembly of the first-born." On the whole, the first seems preferable. For although angels are not elsewhere called the "first-born" of God, they are called "sons of God" (Job. i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7; Gen. vi. 2, 4; Ps. lxxxix. 6) and the designation is here appropriate to denote those who are the pristine inhabitants of heaven. *Cf.* the first choir of Angelicals in the "Dream of Gerontius," who sing:—

> "To us His elder race He gave
> To battle and to win,
> Without the chastisement of pain,
> Without the soil of sin";

and Augustine in *De Civ. Dei*, x. 7, "cum angelis sumus una civitas Dei . . . cujus pars in nobis peregrinatur, pars in illis opitulatur". **πανήγυρις,** meaning a festal gathering of the *whole* people, and **ἐκκλησία** meaning the assembly of all enrolled citizens, seem much more applicable to angels. They are enrolled as citizens (**ἀπογεγ.** see the *Fayûm* and *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, *passim*) in heaven, and welcome the younger sons now introduced. The myriads of angels which on Sinai had made their presence known in thunders and smoke and tempest, terrifying the people, appear now in the familiar form of a well-ordered community in the peaceable guise of citizens rejoicing over additions to their ranks (Luke xv. 10). **καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων,** "and to a Judge who is God of all," and by whose judgment you must therefore stand or fall (*cf.* x. 27, 30, 31). Among the realities to which they had been introduced this could not be omitted. He who is God of all living is the ultimate

Θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ, καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, 23. [p] πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένων, καὶ κριτῇ Θεῷ πάντων, καὶ πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων, 24. [q] καὶ διαθήκης νέας μεσίτῃ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ κρείττονα[1] λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν[2] Ἄβελ. 25. [r] Βλέπετε μὴ παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα. εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἔφυγον,[3] τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς παραιτησάμενοι χρηματίζοντα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν

[p] Luc. x. 20. [q] viii. 6, et ix. 15, et x. 22, et xi. 4; Gen. iv. 10; Exod. xxiv. 8; 1 Tim. ii. 5; 1 Peter i. 2. [r] ii. 3, et x. 28.

[1] T.R. 17, 47; κρειττον ℵACDKLMP, d, f, Vulg.
[2] T.R. in ℵACDKMP, d, f, Vulg.; παρα το in L, b, 106, 108.
[3] T.R. ℵcDcKLM, Thdrt.; εξεφυγον in ℵ*ACP, 17, 57, 118, Chr. 419.

reality, and the Hebrews have been brought near not only to His city with its original inhabitants, but to Himself; and to Himself as allotting without appeal each soul to its destiny. **καὶ πνεύμασι . . .** "and to spirits of just men made perfect," "spirits," as in 1 Pet. iii. 19, of those who have departed this life and not yet been clothed with their resurrection body. **δικαίων τετελειωμένων** is largely illustrated by Wetstein who quotes many examples of "justi perfecti" from the Talmud. It is perhaps more relevant to refer to xi. 4 and to the whole strain of the Epistle whose aim it is to perfect the righteousness of the Hebrews, see chap. vi. Of course O.T. and N.T. saints are referred to. But as without us, *i.e.*, without sharing in our advantages, they could not be perfected, xi. 40, there is at once introduced the recent covenant (**νέας** "new in time," not, as usual, **καίνης** "fresh in quality,") because the idea first in the writer's mind is not the opposition to the old but the recent origin of the new. (But *cf.* Col. iii. 9; 1 Cor. v. 7). It is remarkable that the Mediator of this covenant is here called by his human name "Jesus". The reason probably is that already there is in the writer's mind the great instrument of mediation, **αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ**, "blood of sprinkling". In mediating the old covenant Moses, **λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα κατεσκέδασε τοῦ λαοῦ**, Exod. xxiv. 8. [**αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ**, however, does not occur in LXX, though **ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ** is found four times in *Numbers*]. But in ix. 19 this writer replaces **κατεσκέδασε** with the more significant **ἐράντισεν**; *cf.* ix. 13. In 1 Pet. i. 2 we have **ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**. The "blood of sprinkling" is therefore the blood by which the new covenant is established, see xiii. 20, **αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου**, this blood having the power to cleanse the conscience, ix. 14, x. 22. It cleanses because it speaks better than Abel's, **κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ** for while that of Abel cried for vengeance [Gen. iv. 10, **φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρός με ἐκ τῆς γῆς**] that of Jesus is a message of salvation, the **κρεῖττόν τι** of xi. 40. But it may be adverbial. "Ille flagitabat ultionem, hic impetrat remissionem" (Erasmus).

Ver. 25-29. A final appeal. The readers are warned against being deaf to God's final revelation, for if even the revelation at Sinai could not with impunity be disregarded, much less can the revelation which has reached them and which discloses to them things eternal and God in His essential majesty.

Ver. 25. **βλέπετε** (in the same sense and in a similar connection in iii. 12) **μὴ παραιτήσησθε**, "See that you refuse not"—as those mentioned in ver. 19 did —**τὸν λαλοῦντα**, "Him that speaketh," *i.e.*, God as in i. 1 and the close of this verse; "for if those did not escape (punishment) when they refused Him that made to them divine communications on earth, how much less shall we who turn away from Him who does so from heaven"? The argument is the same as in ii. 3. Those who at Sinai begged to be excused from hearing did so in terror of the manifestations of God's presence. But this is taken both as itself rooted in ignorance of God and aversion, and also as the first manifestation of a refusal to listen which in the history of Israel was often repeated. Punishment followed both in the Sinai generation, iii. 7-19, and in after times. The speaking **ἐπὶ γῆς**, *i.e.*, at Sinai (and through the prophets? i. 1) is contrasted with speaking **ἀπ' οὐρανῶν**, which can only mean speaking from the midst of and in terms of eternal reality, without those earthly

s ver. 19; Agg. ii. 6, 7. t Ps. cii. 26; Matt. xxiv. 35; 2 Peter iii. 10. u 1 Peter ii. 5. v Deut. iv. 24, et ix. 3.

ἀποστρεφόμενοι, 26. [s]οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσε τότε, νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελται, λέγων, "Ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν". 27. [t]Τὸ δὲ, "Ἔτι ἅπαξ," δηλοῖ τῶν σαλευομένων τὴν μετάθεσιν, ὡς πεποιημένων, ἵνα μείνῃ τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα. 28. [u]διὸ βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες, ἔχωμεν χάριν, δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ Θεῷ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ εὐλαβείας.[1] 29. [v]καὶ γὰρ "ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον".

[1] T.R. is only supported by KL, Chrys.; ευλαβειας και δεους in ℵ*ACD*, 17, 71, 73.

symbols which characterised the old revelations, vv. 18, 19. The revelation in the Son is a revelation of the essential Divine nature in terms that are eternally true and valid. *Cf.* ix. 14, **διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου.** The difference between the two revelations is disclosed in their results or accompaniments; of the former, **τότε,** it is said **ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσεν,** "the voice shook the earth," even that symbolic and earthly manifestation was well fitted to convey just impressions of God's holiness; [**ἔδωκε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, ἐσαλεύθη ἡ γῆ** Ps. xlvi. 5, also Ps. xviii. 7 and in Ps. lxviii. 8, **γῆ ἐσείσθη**; Jud. v. 4, 5, sometimes as in Ps. cxiv. 7 more explicitly **ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου ἐσαλεύθη ἡ γῆ.**] The expression sets forth not only the majesty of God who speaks, but also the effects that follow in agitation and alteration [*cf.* the *Antigone* line 163, **τὰ μὲν δὴ πόλεος θεοὶ πολλῷ σάλῳ σείσαντες**]. **νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελται,** "But now he has promised"—the passive used in middle sense as in Rom. iv. 21—the promise is in Hag. ii. 6, 7, where under this strong figure the new order of things introduced by the rebuilding of the temple is announced. (*Cf.* Sir. xvi. 18, 19) **λέγων, Ἔτι ἅπαξ . . .** saying, "Yet once (or, Once more) I will shake not only the earth but also the heaven". And what the writer especially sees in this promise is declared expressly in ver. 27, **τὸ δὲ Ἔτι ἅπαξ δηλοῖ . . .** "the expression 'once more' indicates the removal of what has been shaken as of what has been made (created), that what is not shaken may abide". The **ἅπαξ** indicates the finality of this predicted manifestation of God—only once more was he to reveal Himself. This revelation has made known to us and put us in possession of that which is eternal, so that when all present forms of existence pass away (*cf.* i. 11, 12), what is essential and eternal may still be retained. Underlying the interpretation which the writer gives to **ἅπαξ** is the belief that some time things temporal must give place to things eternal; else he could not have argued that the final "shaking" was to be equivalent to a removal, (**μετάθεσις,** change of place in xi. 5; but in vii. 12 removal, displacement; and so here) or destruction of the heavens and the earth. The words **ὡς πεποιημένων** show that he considered that all that had been made might or would be destroyed, as in i. 10, "the works of God's hands shall perish". (*Cf.* **γένεσις φθορᾶς ἀρχή**]. **ἵνα** is dependent on **μετάθεσιν,** transitory things are removed that the things that are eternal may appear in their abiding value. **διὸ,** seeing that these perishable things must pass away "let us who are receiving a kingdom (a realm in which we shall be as kings, Luke xii. 32, xxii. 29; Rev. i. 6) that is immovable and inalienable have grace" (iv. 16, xii. 15). Many interpreters (Weiss, Westcott, Weizsäcker, Peake) render **ἔχωμεν χάριν** as in Luke xvii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12, "let us feel and express thankfulness" which is a very suitable inference to draw from "our receiving an immovable kingdom" and is relevant also to the following clause. But as **χάρις** is used by this writer in iv. 16 of God's helping favour, and as the **τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ** of ver. 15 is still in view, it seems simpler and more adequate to render as A.V. It is God's grace, **δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν . . .** "by means of which we may acceptably serve God [**λατρεύωμεν** as in ix. 14, possibly in a broader sense than mere worship] with reverence (v. 7) and fear". An additional or recapitulating reason is given in the closing words, "For indeed our God is a consuming fire," words derived from Deut. iv. 24. The fire and smoke which manifested His presence at Sinai (ver. 18) were but symbols of that consuming holiness that destroys all persistent inexcusable evil. It is God Himself who is the fire with which you have to do, not a mere physical, material, quenchable fire.

XIII. 1. [a]Ἡ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΙΑ μενέτω. [b]τῆς φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπι-
λανθάνεσθε· 2. διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους.
3. [c]μιμνήσκεσθε τῶν δεσμίων, ὡς συνδεδεμένοι· τῶν κακουχουμένων,[1]
ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι. 4. τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ ἡ

a Rom. xii. 10; Eph. iv. 2, 3; 1 Peter i. 22, et ii. 17, et iii. 8, et iv. 8.
b Gen. xviii. 1, et xix. 1; Rom. xii. 13; 1 Peter iv. 9.
c Matt. xxv. 36; Rom. xii. 15; Col. iv. 18; 1 Peter iii. 8.

[1] κακοχουμ. in DᶜKLMP.

CHAPTER XIII. In this chapter we find exhortations apparently springing out of a desire to arrest symptoms of a tendency to hide their Christian profession disowning their teachers and fellow Christians and resenting the shame and hardship incident to the following of Christ.

Vv. 1-6. Exhortations to social manifestations of their Christianity. **Ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω.** "Let love of the brethren continue"; it existed (vi. 10) and so, as Chrys. says, he does not write **Γίνεσθε φιλάδελφοι, ἀλλὰ, μενέτω ἡ φιλ.** In the general decay of their faith tendencies to disown Christian fellowship had become apparent, x. 24, 25. This might also lead to a failure to recognise the wants of Christians coming from a distance, therefore hospitality is urged; not as a duty they did not already practise, but, gently, as that which they might omit through forgetfulness and as that which might bring them a message from God: **τῆς φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε,** "Entertainment of strangers do not neglect; for thus some have entertained angels unawares," as in Gen. xviii.-19; Jud. vi. 11-24, xiii. 2-23 [For testimonies to the hospitality of Christians Bleek refers to Lucian, *De Morte Peregrin.*, chap. 16 and to the 49th Epistle of Julian, On the hospitality of the East see Palgrave's *Essays*, p. 246-7.] **ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες** though a common classical idiom, occurs nowhere else in the N.T. Some of their fellow Christians might be in even more needy circumstances and therefore

Ver. 3. **μιμνήσκεσθε** (ii. 6) **τῶν δεσμίων** (x. 34), "Be mindful of those in bonds" (Matt. xxv. 36). This also they had already done (x. 34). The motive now urged is contained in the words **ὡς συνδεδεμένοι,** "as having been bound with them," as fellow-prisoners. The **ὡς ἐν σώματι** of the next clause might invite the interpretation, "for we also are bound as well as they," and colour might be given to this by the Epistle to Diognetus, chap. 6. **χριστιανοὶ κατέχονται μὲν ὡς ἐν φρουρᾷ τῷ κόσμῳ**; but more likely the expression is merely a strong way of saying that all the members of Christ's body suffer with each, 1 Cor. xii. 26. **τῶν κακουχουμένων,** "the maltreated," *cf.* xi. 37; you must be mindful of these "as being yourselves also in the body," *i.e.*, not emancipated spirits, and therefore liable to similar ill-usage and capable of sympathy. [A striking illustration of the manner in which the early Christians obeyed these admonitions may be found in the *Apology* of Aristides: **ξένον ἐὰν ἴδωσιν, ὑπὸ στέγην εἰσάγουσι καὶ χαίρουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ὡς ἐπὶ ἀδελφῷ ἀληθινῷ· οὐ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ἀδελφοὺς ἑαυτοὺς καλοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ψυχήν.** The Syriac Apology adds "If they hear that any of their number is imprisoned or oppressed for the name of their Messiah, all of them provide for his needs". Accordingly in the *Martyrdom* of Perpetua we read that two deacons were appointed to visit her and relieve the severity of her imprisonment.] It is interesting to find that Philo claims for Moses a **φιλαδελφία** towards strangers, enjoining sympathy, **ὡς ἐν διαιρετοῖς μέρεσιν ἕν ζῷον,** as being all one living creature though in diverse parts; and in *De Spec. Legg.* 30 he has **ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἑτέρων σώμασιν αὐτοὶ κακούμενοι.** Westcott gives from early Christian documents a collection of interesting prayers for those suffering imprisonment.

Ver. 4. **τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσιν.** "Is **ἔστω** or **ἐστί** to be supplied?" Probably the former, as in ver. 5, "Let marriage be held in honour among all". As a natural result of holding marriage in honour, its ideal sanctity will be violated neither by the married nor by the unmarried. Therefore the **καὶ** links the two clauses closely together and has some inferential force, "and thus let the bed be undefiled" [**μιαίνειν τὴν κοίτην** occurs in Plutarch to denote the violation of conjugal relations. Used with **γυναῖκα** in Ezek. xviii. 6, xxiii. 17]. The next clause shows in what sense the

κοίτη ἀμίαντος· πόρνους δὲ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεός. 5. [d] ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος· ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν. αὐτὸς γὰρ εἴρηκεν, "Οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω[1]"· 6. [e] ὥστε θαρροῦντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν, "Κύριος ἐμοὶ βοηθὸς, καὶ οὐ φοβηθήσομαι τί ποιήσει μοι ἄνθρωπος". 7. [f] Μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς, μιμεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν.

8. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς χθὲς[2] καὶ σήμερον ὁ αὐτὸς, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. 9. [g] διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ περιφέρεσθε[3]·

[d] Exod. xxiii. 8; Deut. xvi. 19, et xxxi. 6, 8; Jos. i. 5; 1 Par. xxviii. 20; Prov. xv. 16; Matt. vi. 25, 34. Phil. iv. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 6, etc.
[e] Ps. lvi. 4, 11, et cxviii. 6.
[f] ver. 17.
[g] Jer. xxix. 8; Matt. xxiv. 4; Joan. vi. 27; Rom. xiv. 17, et xvi. 17; Eph. iv. 14, et v. 6; Col. ii. 8, 16; 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 3; 1 Joan. iv. 1.

[1] εγκαταλειπω in ℵACDᶜKLMP, 17.
[2] εχθες in ℵAC*D*M; χθες in C³DᶜKL.
[3] T.R. in KL, 47; παραφερεσθε in ℵACDMP, 17, 23, 37, 73.

words are to be taken. William Penn's saying must also be kept in view: "If a man pays his tailor but debauches his wife, is he a current moralist?" For marriage as a preventative against vice, *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. and 1 Thess. iv. 4. Weiss gathers from the insertion of this injunction that the writer is not guided in his choice of precepts by the condition of those to whom he is writing but by "theoretical reflection". But in the face of xii. 16, this seems an unwarranted inference. **πόρνους . . . ὁ θεός.** Fornicators may escape human condemnation, but God (in emphatic position) will judge them.

Ver. 5. As in Eph. v. 5 and elsewhere impurity and covetousness are combined, so here the precepts of ver. 4 lead on to a warning against love of money: **ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος,** "let your turn of mind [disposition] be free from love of money, content with what you have". [**ὁ τρόπος** frequently in classical writers in this sense, as Demosthenes, p. 683, **αἰσχροκερδὴς ὁ τρόπος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.** Other examples in Kypke. **ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῖς παροῦσι** was also commonly used to denote contentment with what one has. Examples in Raphel and Wetstein.] This contentment has the firm foundation of God's promise; **αὐτὸς γὰρ εἴρηκεν,** "for Himself hath said," *i.e.*, God. **Οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ. . . .** The quotation is from Deut. xxxi. 5, where however the third person is used. Similar promises, similarly expressed, occur in Gen. xxviii. 15; Deut. xxxi. 8; Josh. i. 5; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Philo (*De Conf. Ling.*, chap. 32, not 33 as in Bleek and Davidson) gives the quotation literatim as in the text here. **ὥστε θαρροῦντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν,** "so that we boldly say, The Lord is my helper, I will not fear". In Prov. i. 21 wisdom at the gates of the city **θαῤῥοῦσα λέγει.** The words quoted under **λέγειν** are from Ps. cxviii. 6, the first word **Κύριος** and the last **ἄνθρωπος** being brought into strong contrast.

Vv. 7-16. The Hebrews are exhorted to keep in remembrance their former leaders, to abide steadfastly by their teaching, to rid themselves of the ideas of Judaism, to bear the shame attaching to the faith of Christ, to persevere in good works. **Μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν . . .** "Have in remembrance them who had the rule over you, especially as they are those who spoke to you the word of God". **μνημον.** might be used, as in xi. 22 and Gal. ii. x, **τῶν πτωχῶν μνημ.,** of keeping living persons in mind (and so Rendall) but what follows makes it more likely that it here refers to the past. These deceased leading men were the persons alluded to in ii. 3 and iv. 2, who first "spoke" the word of the gospel to the Hebrews and who were now no longer present. The word **ἡγούμενοι,** occurring also in vv. 17 and 24 and in Acts xv. 22 (and *cf.* Sir. xxx. 18, **οἱ ἡγούμενοι ἐκκλησίας**) is a general term for leading and influential men in whom some undefined authority was vested. Official status was not yet defined and official titles were not yet universal. The chief reason why they are to be held in remembrance is given in the clause under **οἵτινες,** "for they are they who". But an additional reason is

καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, οὐ βρώμασιν, ἐν οἷς οὐκ h Exod. xxix. 14; Lev. iv. 12, 21, et vi. 30, et xvi. 27; Num. xix. 3.
ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες.[1] 10. Ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον, ἐξ
οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες. 11. h ὧν
γὰρ εἰσφέρεται ζώων τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἅγια διὰ τοῦ
ἀρχιερέως, τούτων τὰ σώματα κατακαίεται ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς·
12. i διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν, i Joan. xix. 17, 18.
ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἔπαθε. 13. τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς k xi. 10, 16; Mich. ii. 10; Phil. iii. 20.
παρεμβολῆς, τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες· 14. k οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν

[1] περιπατουντες in ℵ*AD*.

suggested in the following clause, **ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες . . .** "whose faith imitate as you closely consider the issue of their manner of life". **ὧν** follows **ἀναστροφῆς. ἀναθεωρέω** in Theophrastus and Diodorus Siculus is explicitly contrasted with the simple verb to denote a keener and more careful observation. We cannot therefore render, as naturally we might, "look back upon". **ἔκβασιν,** in 1 Cor. x. 18 has the meaning "escape"; but in Wisd. ii. xvii., as here, it denotes the end of life with a distinct reference to the manner of it, as illustrating the man's relation to God. The leading men among the Hebrew Christians had, whether by martyrdom (as Weiss, etc.) or not, sealed their teaching and exhibited a faith worthy of imitation. Ver. 8 gives force both to ver. 7 and to ver. 9. Imitate their faith, for the object of faith has not changed nor passed away. **Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐχθὲς. . . .** "Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day is the same, yea and for ever." **ὁ αὐτὸς** exactly as in Plutarch's *Pericles*, xv. 2, where in describing the influence of success upon Pericles it is said **οὐκέθ' ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν,** he was no longer the same. **ἐχθὲς** is the proper Attic form, **χθές** the old Ionic, see Rutherford's *New Phryn.*, 370. "Yesterday and to-day," in the past and in the present Jesus Christ is the same, and He will never be different. Therefore, **διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε.** "Be not carried away by teachings various and unheard of, and foreign." **παραφερ.** is used in Diodorus and Plutarch of being swept away by a river in flood; *cf.* **παραρυῶμεν** of ii. 1. The teachings against which the Hebrews are here warned are such constructions of Old Testament institutions and practises as tended to loosen their attachment to Christ as the sole mediator of the New Covenant. These teachings were "various," inasmuch as they laid stress now on one aspect, now on another of the old economy ["bald in der Schriftgelehrsamkeit, bald in peinlicher Gesetzeserfüllung, bald im Opferkult, bald in den Opfermahlzeiten" (Weiss)]. They were **ξέναι** both as being novel and as being irreconcileable with pure Christian truth. **καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι. . . .** "For it is good that by grace the heart be confirmed, not by meats." The present wavering unsatisfactory condition of the Hebrews is to be exchanged for one of confidence and steadfastness not by listening to teachings about meats which after all cannot nourish the heart, but by approaching the throne where grace reigns and from which it is dispensed, iv. 16. From the following verse (ver. 10) in which sacrificial food is expressly mentioned, it would appear that the reference in **οὐ βρώμασιν** is not to asceticism nor to the distinction of clean and unclean meats, but to sacrificial meals. These are condemned by experiment as useless, **ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν . . .** "which were of no avail to those who had recourse to them" (Moffatt). *Cf.* the **ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές** of vii. 18. Sacrificial meals are also shown to be irreconcileable (**ξέναι**) with the Christian approach to God, for our (the Christian) altar is one from which neither worshippers nor priests have any right to eat. The point he wishes to make is, that in connection with the Christian sacrifice there is no sacrificial meal. As in the case of the great sacrifice of the Day of Atonement the High Priest carried the blood into the Holy of Holies, while the carcase was not eaten but burned outside the camp; so the Christian altar is not one from which food is dispensed to priest and worshipper. **οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες** refers to the Christian worshippers. The figure introduced in **θυσιαστήριον** is continued in these words. To refer them to the O.T. priests is to shatter the argument. Literally the words mean "they who serve the tabernacle," that is,

ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν. 15. [l] Δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως διαπαντὸς τῷ Θεῷ, τουτέστι, καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. 16. [m] τῆς δὲ εὐποιΐας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε· τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ Θεός.

17. [n] Πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν, καὶ ὑπείκετε· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες· ἵνα μετὰ

l Lev. vii. 12; Ps. l. 23, et li. 19; Ose. xiv. 2; Eph. v. 20; 1 Peter ii. 5.
m 2 Cor. ix. 12; Phil. iv. 18.
n ver. 7; Ezech. iii. 18, et xxxiii. 2, 8; Phil. ii. 29; 1 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Peter v. 5.

the priests, *cf.* viii. 5. The peculiarity, he says, of our Christian sacrifice is that it is not eaten. Then follows in support of this statement an analogy from the O.T. ritual, **ὧν γὰρ εἰσφέρεται ζώων. . . .** "For the bodies of those animals, whose blood is brought into the holy place by the High Priest as an offering for sin, are burned outside the camp." *Cf.* Lev. iv. 12, 21. In conformity with this type (**διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς**) Jesus, that He by His own blood might purify the people from their sin, suffered outside the gate. "The burning of the victim was not intended to sublimate but to get rid of it. The body plays no part in the atoning act, and has in fact no significance after the blood has been drained from it. The life, and therefore the atoning energy, resides in the blood and in the blood alone. On the writer's scheme, then, no function is left for the body of Jesus. It is 'through his own blood,' that he must 'sanctify the people'. It is thus inevitable that while the writer fully recognises the fact of the Resurrection of Christ (ver. 20), he can assign no place to it in his argument or attach to it any theological significance" (Peake). The suffering **ἔξω τῆς πύλης** is equivalent to the **αἰσχύνη** of xii. 2; the ignominy of the malefactor's death was an essential element in the suffering. The utmost that man inflicts upon criminals he bore. He was made to feel that he was outcast and condemned. But it is this which wins all men to Him. **τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν . . .** "let us therefore go out to him outside the camp bearing his reproach". *Cf.* xi. 26. Do not shrink from abandoning your old associations and being branded as outcasts and traitors and robbed of your privileges as Jews. This is the reproach of Christ, in bearing which you come nearer to Him. And the surrender of your privileges need not cost you too much regret, "for we have not here (on earth) an abiding city, but seek for that which is to be," that which has the foundations, xi. 10, the heavenly Jerusalem, xii. 22. That which is spiritual and eternal satisfies the ambition and fills the heart. *Cf.* Mark iii. 35; Phil. iii. 20. The want of recognition and settlement on earth may therefore well be borne.

Ver. 15. **δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν ἀναφέρωμεν. . . .** Going without the camp as believers in the virtue of Christ's atoning sacrifice, and bearing His shame as those who seek to be identified with Him, we are brought near to God and are disposed to offer Him a sacrifice of praise (Lev. vii. 2 ff.). The **δι' αὐτοῦ** is in the emphatic position; "through Him" and not through any Levitical device. And this Christian sacrifice is not periodic, but being spiritual is also continual (**διαπαντὸς**). That there may be no mistake regarding the material of the sacrifice of praise, an explanation is added: **τοῦτ' ἔστιν καρπὸν χειλέων,** "that is to say, the fruit of lips (*cf.* Hos. xiv. 3) celebrating His name". Thayer gives this translation, supposing that **ὁμολογ.** is here used in the sense of **ἐξομολογέω,** Ps. xlv. 17, etc.; *cf.* also 1 Esdr. ix. 8. But the sacrifice of praise which can be rendered with the lips is not enough. "Be not forgetful of beneficence and charity for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

Vv. 17-End. The conclusion of the Epistle.

Ver. 17. "Obey your rulers and submit; for they watch for your souls, knowing they are to give account, that they may do this with joy not with lamentation—for this would be profitless to you."

Having exhorted the Hebrews to keep in mind their former rulers and adhere to their teaching, the writer now admonishes them, probably in view of a certain mutinous and separatist spirit (x. 25) encouraged by their reception of strange doctrines, to obey their present leaders, and yield themselves trustfully (**ὑπείκετε**).

χαρᾶς τοῦτο ποιῶσι, καὶ μὴ στενάζοντες· ἀλυσιτελὲς γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῦτο. 18. Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν· πεποίθαμεν γὰρ, ὅτι καλὴν

to their teaching—an admonition which, as Weiss remarks, shows that these teachers held the same views as the writer. The reasonableness of this injunction is confirmed by the responsibility of the rulers and their anxious discharge of it. They watch, like wakeful shepherds (**ἀγρυπνοῦσιν**), or those who are nursing a critical case, in the interest of your souls (**ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν**) to which they may sometimes seem to sacrifice your other interests. They do this under the constant pressure of a consciousness that they must one day render to the Chief Shepherd (ver. 20) an account of the care they have taken of His sheep (**ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες**). Obey them, then, that they may discharge their responsibility and peform these kindly offices for you (**τοῦτο** referring not to **λόγον ἀποδώσοντες** as Vaughan, etc., which would require a much stronger expression than **ἀλυσιτελές**, but to **ἀγρυπνοῦσιν**) joyfully and not with groaning (**στενάζοντες**, the groaning with which one resumes a thankless task, and with which he contemplates unappreciated and even opposed work). And even for your own sakes you should make the work of your rulers easy and joyful, for otherwise it cannot profit you. Your unwillingness to listen to them means that you are out of sympathy with their teaching and that it can do you no good (**ἀλυσιτελὲς γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῦτο**).

Ver. 18. **προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν. . . .** Both the next clause and the next verse seem to indicate that by **ἡμῶν** the writer chiefly, if not exclusively, meant himself; the next clause, for he could not vouch for the conscience of any other person; the next verse because one principal object or result of their prayer was his restoration to them. Request for prayer is common in the Epistles, 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1; Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 18; Col. iv. 3. The reason here annexed is peculiar. "The allusion to his purity of conduct, and strong assertion of his consciousness of it, in regard to them and all things, when he is petitioning for their prayers, implies that some suspicions may have attached to him in the minds of some of them. These suspicions would naturally refer to his great freedom in regard to Jewish practises" (Davidson). But notwithstanding ver. 23 it may be that he was under arrest and shortly to be tried and naturally adds to his request for prayer a protestation of his innocence of all civil offence. [**καλῶς ἀναστραφῆναι** occurs in *Perg. Inscrip.*, v. Deissmann, p. 194, E. Tr.] The writer was conscious of a readiness and purpose to live and conduct himself rightly in all circumstances. This gives him confidence and will lend confidence to their prayers. He is more urgent in this request (**περισσοτέρως παρακαλῶ**) because he is desirous to be quickly restored to them; implying that he in some sense belonged to them and that the termination of his present exile from them would be acceptable to them as well as to him. [The verb **ἀποκαθ.** first occurs in Xenophon, see Anz. p. 338.]

While asking their prayers for himself the writer prays for them; **ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης. . . .** He prays to the God of peace (*cf.* 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9) because this attribute of God carries in it the guarantee that a termination shall be put to all misunderstanding, disturbance, and inability to do His will. His love of peace is shown in nothing more than in His concluding an eternal covenant with men. This covenant was sealed when "our Lord Jesus," having laid down his life for the sheep, was brought up from the dead in virtue of the perfect and accepted sacrifice (**ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης**). Elsewhere in the Epistle the blood is spoken of as giving entrance to the presence of God, here as delivering from that which prevented that entrance. As Vaughan says: "The *arrival* in the heavenly presence for us in virtue of the atoning blood is here viewed in its *start* from the grave. . . . It was in virtue of the availing sacrifice that Christ either left the tomb or re-entered heaven." **ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης** is therefore more naturally connected with **ἀναγαγών** than with **τὸν ποιμένα**, although the two connections are closely related. It was as the Great Shepherd that Jesus gave His life for the sheep and by this act established for ever His claim to be the Shepherd of His people. It is this claim also that guarantees that He will lose none but will raise them up at the last day (*cf.* John xv.). [It is probable that the phrasing of this verse was influenced by Zech. ix. 7, **σὺ ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης σου ἐξαπέ-**

συνείδησιν ἔχομεν, ἐν πᾶσι καλῶς θέλοντες ἀναστρέφεσθαι· 19. περισσοτέρως δὲ παρακαλῶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν.

[o] Esa. xiv. 11; Ezech. xxxiv. 23; Zach. ix. 11; Joan. x. 11; Acts ii. 24; 1 Peter ii. 25, et v. 4.

20. [o]Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου, τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, 21. [p]καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ[1] ἀγαθῷ, εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν[2] ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

[p] 2 Cor. iii. 5; Phil. ii. 13.

22. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως· καὶ γὰρ διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν. 23. Γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον[3] ἀπολελυμένον, μεθ' οὗ, ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται,

[1] ℵD*, d, f, vg. omit **εργω**; CDᶜKMP, Syrsch, Arm., Aeth. insert **εργω**. A has **εργω και λογω αγαθω**.

[2] ℵ*AC*, 17* read **αυτω ποιων**; 71 reads **αυτος ποιων**. T.R. is found in ℵᶜCᵇDKMP. [WH say that "there can be little doubt that **αὐτὸς ποιῶν** is the true reading".]

[3] **ημων** is found in ℵACD*M, 17, 37, 47, 71, vg.

στειλας δεσμίους σου ἐκ λάκκου οὐκ ἔχοντος ὕδωρ, and by Isa. lxiii. 11, **ποῦ ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων.**] The prayer follows, **καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς,** "perfectly equip you" (*cf.* xi. 3) **ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ,** "in every good work," that is, enabling you to do every good work and so equipping you **εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ,** "for the doing of His will," "doing in you that which is well pleasing in His sight through Jesus Christ" (*cf.* Phil. ii. 13). The words **διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** are apparently attached not exclusively to **τὸ εὐάρεστον κ.τ.λ.,** but to the whole clause and espec ally to **καταρτίσαι**; it is through Jesus, now reigning as Christ, that all grace is bestowed on His people. The doxology may be to the God of peace to whom the prayer is addressed, more probably it is to Jesus Christ, last-named and the great figure who has been before the mind throughout the Epistle.

Ver. 22. The writer adds, in closing, a request that the Hebrews would take in good part his "word of exhortation"—a request which implies that they were in an irritable state of mind, if not against the writer, then because their own conscience was uneasy. As a reason for their bearing with his exhortation he urges its brevity "for indeed (**καὶ γὰρ**) I have written (**ἐπέστειλα** as in Acts xv. 20) to you with brevity" (**διὰ βραχέων,** *cf.* **δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα,** 1 Pet. v. 12). To them it might seem that he had said too much; his own feeling was that he had been severely cramped by the limits of a letter.

Ver. 23. **γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν. . . .** "Know that our brother Timothy has been released" (**ἀπολελυμένον,** for example of this use of the participle, see Winer, sec. 45, 4 b). Evidently Timothy had been under arrest; where, when, or why is not known. The information is given because it would interest these Hebrew Christians, who were therefore friends of his, not Judaizers. **μεθ' οὗ . . .** "with whom, if he come soon, I will see you". He takes for granted that Timothy would at once go to them; and he speaks as one who is himself free or is immediately to be free to determine his own movements. [**τάχειον,** = **θᾶττον,** a comparative in the sense of a positive; a classical usage; and *cf.* John xiii. 27, **ὃ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον.**] The usual greetings are added. Epistolary form required this (see the Egyptian papyri) but in view of what the writer has said regarding the rulers, and in view of the **πάντας** here expressed, it may be supposed that the formula was here filled with significant contents. Who was to convey the salutations? Or, in other words, who was directly to receive the letter? Probably one or two of the leading men representing the Church. This would account for the **πάντας.** The greetings were not on the writer's part only. **οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας,** "they of Italy" joined

ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς. 24. Ἀσπάσασθε πάντας τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν, καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. 25. ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.

Πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου.

in them. The form of expression is that which is ordinarily used to denote natives of a place, as in Luke xxiii. 50; John i. 44, xi. 1; Acts xvii. 13, etc. Winer says (p. 785): "a critical argument as to the place at which the Epistle was written should never have been founded on these words". Vaughan is certainly wrong in saying that the more natural suggestion of the words would be that the writer is himself in Italy and speaks of the Italian Christians surrounding him. The more natural suggestion, on the contrary, is that the writer is absent from Italy and is writing to it and that therefore the native Italians who happen to be with him join him in the salutations he sends to their compatriots.

The Epistle closes with one of the usual formulae, "Grace be with you all".

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES

INTRODUCTION.

I. Authorship and Date.—§ 1. *External Data.* That parts, at all events, of this Epistle were known and cited by very early Church writers seems certain. It is, however, precarious to build too much upon the fact that similarities of thought and expression are found between this Epistle and other early writings. Such similarities do not necessarily prove anything more than that the thought-movements of the times were exercising the minds of many thinkers and writers. If, that is to say, it is found that various writings belonging to the early ages of Christianity contain thoughts, words, and even sentences which are also seen to occur in this Epistle, it would be arbitrary to assume that this fact necessarily proved the influence of the latter upon the former, or *vice-versa*; and it would, moreover, be dangerous to use this assumption as a basis upon which to found conclusions regarding the date and authorship of the Epistle. We are far from denying that the similarities referred to *may* denote indebtedness on the part of the writer of our Epistle to the writings in question, or *vice versa*—as, for example, in the case of *Sirach*—but in such cases there must be no doubt as to whether the particular writing is earlier or later than our Epistle. A concrete example will make our meaning clear. Some writers regard the similarity of language between the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and *St. James* as evidence that the latter influenced the former, and this is regarded as evidence in favour of an early date of our Epistle. Thus Lightfoot (*Galatians*, p. 320, note), says that the language of the writer of the *Testaments* on the subject of the law of God is "formed on the model of the Epistle of St. James," and he refers to Ewald, who makes a similar remark; again, on p. 221, note, he says in reference to this pseudepigraph: "On the whole, however, the language in the moral and didactic portions takes its colour from the Epistle of St. James". So, too, Mayor (*The Epistle of St. James*, p. iv.) speaks of the writer of this work as one "who seems to have been much influenced by the teaching and example of St. James," and a large number of quotations are given to prove this contention.

Now, Charles, who may justly be claimed as our leading authority on all that concerns the *Pseudepigrapha*, has shown conclusively in his edition of the *Testaments* (1908) that this work was written originally in Hebrew in 109-106 B.C.; the Jewish additions he regards as belonging to the years 70-40 B.C., and in its Greek form it appeared "at the latest" in 50 A.D.; the thirty Christian interpolations (approximately) belong probably to different dates, but scarcely any of these come into consideration in the present connection (see pp. l.-lxv.); instances of *St. James* probably utilising the *Testaments* are given on p. xc. Or, to mention another instance, the similarities between *St. James* and the *Epistle to the Corinthians* of Clement of Rome are likewise pointed to as a proof of the early date of *St. James*, because Clement (end of first century and beginning of second century) was influenced by it; but the most striking part of this similarity is the way in which each deals with the subject of faith and works. This subject was, however, one of the fundamental causes of difference between Jews and Christians at all times (indeed, the minds of thinking Jews were exercised by it *before* the Christian era), and it is dealt with in a number of other works of various dates—*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Testament of Abraham*, *Apoc. of Baruch*, 2 (4) *Esdras*, *Book of Enoch*, and often in the later Jewish literature;—therefore it is difficult to see why *St. James* necessarily influenced Clement on a subject which was so much in evidence in a large variety of writings; and the statement of Mayor, that "the fact that Clement balances the teaching of St. Paul by that of St. James is sufficient proof of the authority he ascribes to the latter" (p. lii.), seems a little too strong, especially as St. James is not mentioned by name in Clement. Similarities are also found between *St. James* and pseudo-Clement, the *Didache*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the *Epistles of Ignatius*, Hermas, Justin Martyr, the *Epistle to Diognetus*, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and the Clementine Homilies; all these authorities, ranging from the first century to the former half of the third, are often pointed to as showing their recognition of our Epistle, because they show the marks of its influence upon them. The possibility of such indebtedness is not denied, but in the majority of cases it cannot be said that the similarities *prove* it; nor do they necessarily prove the canonicity, and still less the authorship of our Epistle, especially as not in one single instance is the Epistle mentioned by name in the authorities mentioned above. The earliest writer, as far as is known, who refers to the Epistle definitely as Scripture, and as having been written by St. James, is Origen

(d. 254 A.D.). His testimony is as follows: In his commentary on *St. John* xix. 6 he refers to our Epistle in the words, . . , ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν, a phrase which obviously suggests doubt as to its authorship, though apparently it is quoted as Scripture. On the other hand, passages from our Epistle are quoted as the words of "James the Apostle" on at least five occasions; and besides this, there are a number of cases in which direct quotations from it are clearly regarded as Scripture. This is, moreover, definitely asserted in his *Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.*, iv. 1, and in *Hom. in Lev.*, ii. 4. On four occasions St. James is mentioned by name, once as the "brother of the Lord". Further, quotations, more or less distinct, from our Epistle are found in the *Constitutiones Apostolicae* (fourth century, but containing earlier material), and in Lactantius (c. 300 A.D.). The next important writer who gives direct evidence on the subject is Eusebius (c. 270-340 A.D.). In speaking of the Catholic Epistles, and after referring to the martyrdom of James the Just, he says: "The first of the Epistles styled Catholic is said to be his. But I must remark that it is held to be spurious (νοθεύεται). Certainly not many old writers have mentioned it, nor yet the Epistle of Jude, which is also one of the Epistles called Catholic. But nevertheless we know that these have been publicly used with the rest in most churches" (*H.E.*, ii. 23). Then, again, in enumerating the list of New Testament books (*H.E.*, iii. 25), he says: "Among the controverted books (ἀντιλεγόμενα), which are nevertheless well known and recognised by many (γνωρίμων ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς), we class the Epistle circulated under the name of James". In spite of this, however, Eusebius prefaces a quotation from the Epistle (v. 13) with the words, λέγει γοῦν ὁ ἱερὸς Ἀπόστολος (*Comm. in Ps.* i.), and later on in the same work he refers to another passage from the Epistle (iv. 2) as Scripture (. . . τῆς γραφῆς λεγούσης . . .). At the same time it will be wise not to build too much upon these last two references. In a case like this, where the writer would, if anything, be biassed in favour of ascribing Apostolic authorship to the Epistle, a passage which casts doubt upon its genuineness is really more weighty evidence than one in the opposite direction; moreover, a book which went by a certain name might well be quoted by Eusebius in accordance with the common acceptation, without his adding, each time he mentioned it, his doubts concerning the correctness as to its title. Upon the whole, the evidence of Eusebius, though uncertain, seems to point to our Epistle as being genuine Scripture, but not as having been written by St. James. This uncertain testimony is repeated by Jerome (born c. 330-350 A.D.), who says in his *De Viris*

Illustr., ii.: "Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini . . . unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quae de septem Catholicis est, quae et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur, licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem" (quoted by Westcott, *Canon of the N.T.*, p. 452); elsewhere, however, Jerome quotes from the Epistle as from Scripture. This evidence, therefore, runs on somewhat the same lines as that of Eusebius; and when it is remembered that these two writers stand out as the two greatest authorities of antiquity on the subject of the Canon, it must be conceded that their witness ought almost to be regarded as final. It is worth recalling that recently Jerome's *status* as a reliable witness has been greatly strengthened by the discovery of a gospel-fragment[1] which in the MS. in which it has been discovered forms a part of the Longer Ending of the canonical Gospel of St. Mark. "Writing against the Pelagians in 415-416 (*C. Pelag.*, ii. 15), Jerome quoted a passage which 'in some copies [of the Latin Gospels] and especially in Greek codices' followed immediately after St. Mark xvi. 14 [the words are then given]; hitherto Jerome's statement has been entirely without support; now at length it has been recovered in the Greek. . . ."[2] Three other facts of importance must be recorded regarding the external *data* as to authorship; they concern the question of canonicity, and therefore indirectly that of authorship. The Muratorian Fragment, which "may be regarded on the whole as a summary of the opinion of the Western Church on the Canon shortly after the middle of the second century" (Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 212), omits *St. James* in its list of canonical writings. Secondly, our Epistle is not included in the Syriac version of the N.T. brought to the Syrian Church by Palūt, bishop of Edessa, at the beginning of the third century; "the *Catholic Epistles* and the *Apocalypse* formed no part of the old Syriac version. In the Peshitta this defect is partially supplied by a translation of James, 1 Peter and 1 John, in agreement with the usage of Antioch as represented by Chrysostom" (Burkitt in *Encycl. Bibl.* iv. col. 5004); Prof. Burkitt quotes *Addai*, 46: "The Law and the Prophets and the Gospel . . . and the Epistles of Paul . . . and the Acts of the Twelve Apostles—these writings shall ye read in the Churches of Christ, and besides these ye shall read nothing else"; and adds, "Neither in Aphraates nor in the genuine works of Ephraim are there any quotations from the Apocalypse or the Catholic Epistles." And thirdly, our Epistle

[1] See the *Biblical World*, pp. 138 ff. (1908).

[2] Swete in the *Guardian*, 1st April, 1908; see also Swete, *Zwei neue Evangelien-fragmente*, p. 9 (1908); Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, pp. 25 ff. (1908).

does not figure in the "Cheltenham List". The first time that the Epistle appears to have been officially recognised as canonical was at the council of Carthage 397 A.D.[1]

The balance of the historical evidence of the first three and a half centuries is thus distinctly against St. James having been the author of this Epistle. If we had external evidence alone to go upon we should assuredly be compelled to follow what seems to have been the opinion of Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome; that is to say that, while on the whole regarding the Epistle as canonical, it is difficult to believe that St. James can have been the author.

If the Epistle was written by St. James, it is almost universally granted that it must have been the St. James who presided at the council of Jerusalem—"James the Lord's brother"—who was the author (see § 2 below), the claims of any other of this name being too inconsiderable to be seriously thought of; but in this case it is difficult to account for the fact that doubt was thrown upon the canonicity of the Epistle for so long, and still more difficult is it to account for the fact that the name of St. James was not connected with it from the beginning. The position of authority which the Apostle held in the early Church (Acts xii. 17; Gal. i. 18, 19), the important fact of his having already inspired an Epistle (Acts xv. 19, 20), and the traditions concerning him in later times (see Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. ix. 1; Eusebius, *H.E.* II. 23), all lead to the supposition that if the Epistle had really been written by him it would have been accepted as genuine and canonical from the first, in which case the doubtful expressions of Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, and the adverse testimony of the Old Syriac Version and the Muratorian Fragment would have been impossible.

On the other hand, it must be allowed that there are strong *a priori* arguments in favour of St. James' authorship. The position held by him in the early Church compels one to expect writings from him; the head of the mother-Church of Christendom would, of all people, be the most obvious one from whom one would look for communications of one kind or another to daughter-churches. Still more within the natural order of things would be an Epistle of a general character—something in the form of an encyclical—addressed not to any particular local Church, but to the whole body of believers; the fact that this one is addressed to the Dispersion only strengthens the argument, because, in the earliest days, the nucleus of the

[1] It was also accepted by the somewhat earlier but much less important Council of Laodicea, about 363 A.D.

Christian congregations was formed by those who were Jews by race. Secondly, there is the analogy of the Epistle inspired by him at the Council of Jerusalem; this fact proves that the Apostle recognised it to be within his province to inspire—if nothing more—communications to distant Churches; this particular epistle was addressed to Gentiles, whose conversion lay more particularly within the province of St. Paul, the more reason, therefore, that Jewish converts should also be written to by the head of the Church of Jerusalem, the city which these had always looked upon as their "Mother". And then, thirdly, although, as we have already seen, the early patristic evidence is not in favour of St. James' authorship, we are bound to recognise the fact that there was a tradition as early as the beginning of the third century which brought the name of St. James into connexion with this Epistle.

It is fully realised—and the point needs emphasis—that weighty arguments can be adduced against both sets of considerations mentioned above; it is just the most perplexing thing regarding this Epistle that whether an early or a late date be contended for, whether the authorship of St. James be insisted on, or that of some other, unknown, writer, no *conclusive* argument can be put forth on either side; nothing has yet been said on either side which has forced conviction on the other. It must be allowed, further, that the objections raised against the contentions on either side are, in almost every instance, strong, and are not to be brushed aside offhand. Considerations of space forbid even an enumeration of the many arguments which are urged on either side, recourse must be had to the more comprehensive Commentaries for this; but the fact is certainly noteworthy that, no matter how strong the arguments put forth on either side, valid objections can be urged against one and all; either position taken up seems so strong from one point of view, and is yet so weakened from another point of view. The one positive conclusion to be drawn from this seems to be the paradoxical one that both are right; that is to say, that an Epistle, which is embodied in our present one, was originally written by St. James, and that to it were added subsequently other elements. This is a procedure which could be paralleled by other examples, spurious additions made to authentic documents, in perfect good faith, being not unknown—*e.g.*, the Longer Ending of St. Mark's Gospel. Proof for this contention is as little forthcoming as for the various other theories that have been suggested, but it would at least account for the conflicting evidence of Origen, Eusebius and Jerome; and when we come to deal with the internal evidence of the Epistle, it will be seen to account for

more than one perplexing feature. It is at best a *faute de mieux* and, for the present, does not profess to be anything more.

§ 2. *Internal Data.*—The writer of the Epistle calls himself James, and in addressing the "twelve tribes of the Dispersion" shows himself to have been a man of more than ordinary authority. According to the evidence of the New Testament, there was only one James who occupied a position of authority such as is implied in this Epistle, namely, "James, the Lord's brother"; thus in Gal. i. 18, 19, St. Paul tells of how after the three years' retirement which followed after his conversion, he went and saw St. Peter and "James the Lord's brother"; in Acts xii. 17 we read that when St. Peter had been released from prison he said to his friends: "Tell these things unto James, and to the brethren"; again, in Gal. ii. 9 St. Paul recounts the action of "James, and Cephas, and John, who were reputed to be pillars," and who, on seeing that grace had been given to him, offered to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, "that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision"; and further, in the same passage, ver. 12, the mention of certain men "who came from James" marks him out as a leader. Then, and perhaps most important of all, there is the account in Acts xv. 4-29 of the council at Jerusalem, at which the leading part is taken by St. James.[1] Once more, in Acts xxi. 18 the position of importance which St. James occupied is again clearly seen in that when St. Paul and his companions had returned to Jerusalem after their missionary journey they were first received, apparently informally, by the brethren, and then on the following day "they went unto James, and all the elders were present"; these words plainly imply something in the nature of an official, formal reception. Lastly, in 1 Cor. xv. 7, St. Paul speaks of the special appearance of our Lord after His resurrection to St. James. It is certainly worth particular notice that among these references to St. James the most important are supplied directly or indirectly by St. Paul; this fact should of itself be sufficient to show the improbability of any conscious antagonism between the teaching on the subject of faith and works as contained respectively in the Pauline Epistles and that of St. James—assuming the latter to be authentic. At all events, the leading position held by St. James which these passages reveal, makes it in the highest degree probable that the James mentioned in the opening verse of our Epistle is to be identified with "James the Lord's brother".

[1] Note how his very words in Acts xv. 20 are incorporated in the letter which he sent (verse 29).

The next point in the internal evidence to emphasise is the similarity to be observed between the letter inspired by St. James, together with his speech, at the council of Jerusalem, and certain parts of the Epistle which bears his name. The most important of these are as follows :—

(i.) The salutation, χαίρειν, Acts xv. 23, Jas. i. 1 ; this form is found elsewhere in the New Testament only in Acts xxiii. 26.

(ii.) The words, τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, in Jas. ii. 7, which can only be paralleled in the New Testament by those in Acts xv. 17 : ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπ' αὐτούς.

(iii.) The occurrence of the word ὄνομα in a specially pregnant sense, Jas. ii. 7, v. 10, 14, and Acts xv. 14, 26 ; this is not used elsewhere in the New Testament in quite the same sense.

(iv.) The pointed allusions to the Old Testament, which are characteristic of St. James' speech, *viz.*, Acts xv. 14, 16-18, 21, also play an important part in the Epistle, or at least in certain parts of it.

(v.) The affectionate term ἀδελφός, which occurs so often in the Epistle (i. 2, 9, 16, 19 ; ii. 5, 15 ; iii. 1 ; iv. 11 ; v. 7, 9, 10, 12, 19), is also found in Acts xv. 13, 23 ; especially noticeable is the verbal identity between Jas. ii. 5, ἀκούσατε ἀδελφοί μου, and Acts xv. 13, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ ἀκούσατέ μου.

(vi.) Other verbal coincidences are : ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, Jas. i. 27, Acts xv. 14 ; τηρεῖν and διατηρεῖν, Jas. i. 27, Acts xv. 29 ; ἐπιστρέφειν, Jas. v. 19, 20, Acts xv. 19 ; ἀγαπητός, Jas. i. 16, 19, ii. 5, Acts xv. 25. In some of these cases too much stress must not be laid upon the similarities ; but it is certainly striking that in the rather restricted scope which the short passage in Acts offers there should, nevertheless, be so many points of similarity with portions of the Epistle. The fact almost compels us to recognise the same mind at work in each, though this does not necessarily apply to the whole of the Epistle ascribed to St. James.

Further internal evidence as to authorship is afforded by indications which point to the writer as having been a Jew. And the first point that strikes one here is the copious use of the O.T. which is characteristic of the writer. There are, it is true, only five *direct* verbal quotations, *viz.*, i. 11 from Isa. xl. 7 ; ii. 8 from Lev. xix. 18 ; ii. 11 from Exod. xx. 13.14 ; ii. 23 from Gen. xv. 6 ; iv. 6 from Prov. iii. 34 ; but the atmosphere of the O.T. is a constituent element of the Epistle ; for over and above the O.T. events which are mentioned, there is an abundance of clear references to it, which shows that the mind of the writer was saturated with the spirit of the ancient

Scriptures. Some of the most obvious of these references are the following: i. 10, see Ps. cii. 4-11; ii. 21, see Gen. xxii. 9-12; ii. 23, see Isa. xli. 8, 2 Chron. xx. 7; ii. 25, see Josh. ii. 1 ff.; iii. 6, see Prov. xvi. 27; iii. 9, see Gen. i. 26; iv. 6, see Job xxii. 29; v. 2, see Job xiii. 28; v. 11, see Job i. 21-22, ii. 10; v. 17-18, see 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 41-45. Further, there is the use of the specifically Israelite name for God, "Jehovah Sabaoth" (v. 4), and the references to Law (*Torah*) in ii. 8-12, iv. 11; this use of νόμος, *i.e.*, without the article, is in accordance with the extended use of the word *Torah* among the Jews, meaning as it does, not only the Law given on Mount Sinai, not only the whole of the Pentateuch, but also the entire body of religious precepts in general (see especially ii. 12, where right speaking and acting in general are included under proper *Torah*-observance). The reference to γέεννα in iii. 6, is also a distinct mark of Jewish authorship; and the way in which the prophets are spoken of in v. 10 points in the same direction. It is to be observed that the use of the O.T. is wide, all three of the great divisions of the Jewish Canon—Law, Prophets, and Writings—being represented.

But what speaks still more for Jewish authorship is the accumulation of many small points indicative of Hebrew methods of thought, expression, and phraseology; examples of this abound in the Epistle, indeed its "Hebraic" colouring is one of its most pronounced characteristics. While it will not be necessary to give exhaustive lists, some examples of the different categories of the small points just referred to must be offered.

(i.) There are a number of instances in which the Greek is reminiscent of Hebrew phraseology; it is not meant by this to imply that a Hebrew text was the original form of such passages and phrases, but only that the Greek form of the expression of thought seems to be moulded from a Hebrew pattern, *i.e.*, that the mind of the writer was accustomed to express itself after the manner of one to whom Hebrew ways of thinking were very familiar, and who in writing Greek, therefore, almost unconsciously reverted to the Hebrew mode. The point of what has been said will perhaps be best realised when it is seen how naturally, in a number of instances, a Hebrew equivalent of the Greek suggests itself, *e.g.*: ii. 7 . . . τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, it will be seen that the Hebrew equivalent of this sounds more natural: את־השם הטוב אשר נקרא עליכם . . . ; iii., 18 . . . ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην, although there is no fault to find with the Greek, a Hebrew equivalent suggests itself almost spontaneously:

בשלום יזרע לעשי השלום . . . ; the same may be said of the following: i. 12, . . . τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, עטרת החיים; i. 19 . . . βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν, קשה לדבר וקשה לכעוס; ii. 12, οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε, כן דברו וכן עשו; ii. 23, ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, תחשב־לו לצדקה; iii. 18, καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης, פרי הצדקה; iv. 10, ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, השפלו לפני יהוה; iv. 13, ἄγε νῦν οἱ λέγοντες . . . , v. 1, ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλούσιοι, for this mode of address *cf.* Am. vi. 1, הוי השאננים בציון; v. 3 ὁ ἰὸς αὐτῶν εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν ἔσται, והיתה חלאתם בכם לעדות; v. 8, στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, אמצו לבבכם; v. 10, 14, ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, בשם יהוה; v. 17, προσηύξατο τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι, לבלתי היות מטר . . . . It is not suggested that in these, as well as in a number of other cases, the Greek is a translation from the Hebrew; but it will not be denied that the form of the Greek does suggest the Hebrew idiom, and therefore that the writer was a Jew.[1]

(ii.) Secondly, the well-known predilection for assonance on the part of Hebrew writers appears in this Epistle, and is further illustrative of the "Hebraic" colouring of it; this is noticeable both in the repetition of the same words or roots, as well as in the tendency to alliteration; so marked a feature of the Epistle is this that it is met with in almost every verse, and therefore only a few examples need be given: i. 4, ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω ἵνα ἦτε τέλειοι. i. 13, μηδεὶς πειραζόμενος λεγέτω ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πειράζομαι· ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστιν κακῶν. i. 19, . . . βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν. iii. 6, καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης. iii. 7, πᾶσα γὰρ φύσις . . . δαμάζεται . . . τῇ φύσει. iii. 18, . . . ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην. iv. 8, ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐγγίσει ὑμῖν. iv. 11. μὴ καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων ἀδελφοί· ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἢ κρίνων τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καταλαλεῖ νόμου καὶ κρίνει νόμον· εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις οὐκ εἶ ποιητὴς νόμου ἀλλὰ κριτής . . . v. 7-8, μακροθυμήσατε οὖν ἀδελφοί . . .

[1] We are not forgetting Deissmann's very true words: "We have come to recognise that we had greatly over-estimated the number of Hebraisms and Aramaisms in the Bible. Many features that are non-Attic and bear some resemblance to the Semitic and were therefore regarded as Semiticisms, belong really to the great class of international vulgarisms, and are found in vulgar papyri and inscriptions as well as in the Bible" (*The Philology of the Greek Bible*, pp. 62 f., 1908); but it is not the language so much as the mode of thought, which, when expressed in Hebrew, is so often reminiscent of O. T. phraseology, to which we refer.

μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἕως λάβῃ πρόϊμον καὶ ὄψιμον. μακροθυμήσατε καὶ ὑμεῖς . . . The following are some good instances of alliteration: i. 2, πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις. iii. 5, μικρὸν μέλος ἐστὶν καὶ μεγάλα αὐχεῖ. iii. 8, τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται. iv. 8, καθαρίσατε χεῖρας . . . ἁγνίσατε καρδίας. How thoroughly in the Hebrew fashion this repetition of words and alliterative tendency is may be seen by observing a few examples, taken quite at random, from the O.T., *e.g.*, Am. vi. 7, 13; Isa. ix. 5; Nah. i. 2; Ps. cxix. 13, cxxii. 6, etc., etc.

(iii.) Instances of pleonastic phraseology in the Epistle must also be regarded as witnessing to Jewish authorship; among such are the following: i. 8, ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, corresponding to the Hebrew איש; the same is seen in i. 12, μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὅς . . . *Cf.* Ps. i. 1, אשרי האיש אשר; i. 19, ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος; i. 7, μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος . . .; i. 23, οὗτος ἔοικεν ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι . . .; ii. 2, ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος. Suggestive of Hebrew phraseology, again, are such passages as iii. 7, τῶν ἵππων τοὺς χαλινοὺς εἰς τὰ στόματα βάλλομεν εἰς τὸ πείθεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν; iv. 2, οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς. Reminiscent of Hebrew thought are also the words in i. 15, ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν; for the similar idea see Ps. vii. 14, *Behold he travaileth with iniquity, yea he hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood;* so, too, the words in ii. 7, βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ ὄνομα . . .; here, moreover, the omission of the preposition should be noticed; then also, in v. 7, the familiar πρόϊμον καὶ ὄψιμον (*cf.* Jer. v., 24, נשם יורה ומלקוש), and in v. 17, the regular Hebraism προσευχῇ προσηύξατο (תפלה התפלל).

(iv.) The Hebraic character of the Epistle is further illustrated by a certain terse and forcible way of putting things, reminding one often of the prophetic style, *e.g.*, ii. 3, *Sit thou here in a good place*, and in the same verse, *Stand thou there;* iv. 2 ff., *Ye lust and have not; ye kill, and covet, and cannot obtain; ye fight and war; ye have not because ye ask not. . . . Ye adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity against God?* iv. 7, *Be subject, therefore, unto God; but resist the devil.* v. 1, *Go to now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries which are coming upon you.* Then, again, the way in which vivid pictures are presented in few but pregnant words is also illustrative of the same prophetic style, *e.g.*, in i. 6, the picture of the man who doubts; in ii. 2, of the rich man and the poor man entering the synagogue; and in v. 4, of the defrauded labourers. Under this heading must also be mentioned the distinctive way in which the writer of the Epistle

frames many of his sentences; generally speaking they are short and simple, which points, perhaps, to a natural habit of forming them on the Hebrew or Aramaic pattern; indirect statement is never expressed by the infinitive, but only by ὅτι with the indicative; the simple structure will be seen from the following instances: i. 3, γινώσκοντες ὅτι . . . κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν. i. 7, μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω . . . ὅτι λήμψεται . . . ii. 20, θέλεις δὲ γνῶναι . . . ὅτι ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων ἀργή ἐστιν; ii. 24, ὁρᾶτε ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος. ii. 19, σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν. ii. 22, βλέπεις ὅτι ἡ πίστις συνήργει . . . iii., 1, . . . εἰδότες ὅτι μεῖζον κρίμα λημψόμεθα. iv. 5, δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφὴ λέγει . . . ; v. 11, . . . εἴδετε ὅτι πολύσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος. This fact of there being no subordination of sentences, but only co-ordination is very suggestive of the simple Hebrew construction of sentences. Mention should also be made of the entire absence of the optative mood in the Epistle. On the other hand, we have instances of the prophetic perfect, in v. 2, σέσηπεν and γέγονεν, in v. 3, κατίωται; and also of the gnomic aorist, *e.g.*, i. 2, ἀνέτειλεν, where the Hebrew idiom is imitated, see Isa. xl., 7, . . . יבש חציר נבל ציץ. Further, the extended use of the word ποιεῖν is extremely suggestive of Hebrew usage, *e.g.*, ii. 13, ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος, the phrase sounds more natural in Hebrew: . . . לאשר לא־עשׂה חסד; i. 22, γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου, Hebrew: והיו עשׂי הדבר, *cf.* i. 25; ii. 8, καλῶς ποιεῖτε, Hebrew: לעשׂות תיטיבו, *cf.* ii. 19; iii. 12, μὴ δύναται συκῆ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι, Hebrew: היוכל עץ התאנה לעשׂות זיתים; iii. 18, τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην Hebrew: לעשׂי שלום; iv. 13, . . . καὶ ποιήσομεν ἐκεῖ ἐνιαυτὸν . . . . Hebrew: ונעשׂה שם שנה . . . And, once more, the extended use of διδόναι in v. 18, is also in accordance with the Hebrew idiom. Lastly, there are a few other minor points which seem to betray greater familiarity with Hebrew than with Greek idiom; among these are; *the use of the genitive of quality*, *e.g.*, i. 15, ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς, ii. 4, κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν, iii. 6, κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας (See Vorst, *Hebr.* . . . pp. 244 ff.); *the lax use of number*, *e.g.*, ii. 15, ἐὰν ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοὶ ὑπάρχωσιν . . . ; iii. 14, εἰ ἐριθίαν ἔχετε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν . . . ; iii. 10, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα; *the use of the article is inconsistent;* and *the disregard of cases is, in some instances, irregular*, *e.g.*, iii. 9, καταρώμεθα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους (acc. instead of dat.), v. 6, κατεδικάσατε τὸν δίκαιον (acc. instead of gen.) *cf.* Mayor *in loc.* While allowing due weight to "international vulgarisms," one cannot help feeling that many of these features

point to a Jewish atmosphere of thought, and a Jewish mode of expression.

From all that has been said, therefore, it must be clear that the author of our Epistle was a Jew; as far as it goes, this evidence is in the direction of favouring the authorship of St. James; though it is, of course, far from being in any sense conclusive. But while the internal evidence, so far, speaks distinctly in favour of St. James being the writer of the Epistle, there are some other weighty considerations which point in the opposite direction. Firstly, one might reasonably have expected in an Epistle written by St. James that the fact of his having been the brother of the Lord would have been specially mentioned; this, one might think, would have been insisted on for its own sake, quite apart from the authority and prestige which the mention of it would have conferred upon the writer. Though the fact would have been well known in his immediate surroundings, or even throughout Palestine, and would therefore not have necessitated mention in an Epistle addressed to Palestinian congregations, it was different when, as in the present case, the scattered churches of the Dispersion were being written to; the more authoritative the name of the person who addressed them, the more effective would be the influence of the Epistle upon them. The occurrence of the Lord's name in the opening verse of the Epistle—"a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ"—offered a natural and obvious opportunity for the mention of the writer's close tie to Him. In reply to this it may well be said that after the resurrection of Christ, and the consequent proclamation of His Divinity to all the world, there would be a natural and very seemly hesitation, on the part of those who were His relations after the flesh, to assert this tie; but this argument is to some extent weakened by the words in John xix. 25-27, which were written later than our Epistle (on the assumption of St. James' authorship): "But there were standing by the Cross of Jesus His mother and His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw His mother, and the disciple standing by whom He loved, He saith unto His mother . . . "; if St. John could record thus distinctly the relationship between our Lord and the Blessed Virgin so long after, there does not seem sufficient reason why St. James should not have referred to his own relationship with our Lord. Apart, however, from the non-mention of this relationship, one might, at any rate, have expected a reference to apostleship in the opening verse of the Epistle; for that St. James was regarded as an apostle in the early Church is clear from 1 Cor. xv. 7, Acts xv. 22, Gal. ii. 8, 9. A second reason

for questioning the authorship of St. James is the absence of any references to the great outstanding events connected with our Lord's Person—His manner of life on earth, His sufferings and death, His resurrection and ascension. There are special reasons for expecting to find such references in this Epistle—assuming it to have been written by St. James. It is almost impossible to believe that one who had known Christ, and had been an eye-witness of His doings and a hearer of His teaching, should maintain such absolute silence on these things when addressing a letter to fellow-believers which touches otherwise on such a large variety of subjects. If there was one thing of paramount importance in the early days of Christianity it was that the fact of Christ's resurrection should be proclaimed; one has but to remember how often reference is made to this in the Acts—about twenty-five times—how it is mentioned or implied in all the Pauline Epistles, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as in I Peter and 1 and 2 John, to realise the conviction and practice of the other apostles in this; and yet St. James, to whom had been vouchsafed a special manifestation of the risen Lord, can write an Epistle to Jewish-Christians who were scattered abroad without the slightest reference, implicit or explicit, to this cardinal tenet of the faith! The fact of the Epistle being addressed to the Dispersion makes this omission all the more strange; for on the assumption that St. James wrote it, *i.e.*, that it was probably the earliest in date of all the books of the New Testament, there must have been many among those addressed who would require strengthening in their belief, or who would possibly have heard of the resurrection for the first time from a "pillar" of the Church, supposing it had been mentioned; and, therefore, one might reasonably have expected to have found it occupying a central position in the Epistle. It is fully realised that to argue from omissions is not always safe; it is, however, impossible not to be struck by the omissions referred to if the Epistle was written by St. James. On the assumption of a late date, at all events for the bulk of the Epistle, when the main tenets of the faith, such as the resurrection, were regarded as "first principles" and were meant rather for "babes" in faith (*cf.* Heb. vi. 1 and context), these omissions would not cause surprise; but they would be very difficult to account for on the assumption of St. James' authorship, which would imply a date prior to c. 63 A.D. for its composition. In reply to this it may well be urged that in Acts xv. we have an instance of an Epistle written in the earliest ages of Christianity in which no references to the cardinal tenets of the faith are found; but in an Epistle like this (Acts xv. 23 ff.), written for one specific

purpose, and therefore of small scope, such references cannot well be expected. The possibility is conceivable that a similar letter, though addressed to a different class of hearers, may have constituted the original form of the Epistle that now bears the name of St. James; in this case the absence of the references spoken of above would be quite comprehensible.

Another omission which is likewise difficult to account for on the assumption of the authorship of St. James, is that of any direct reference to Christ as the Messiah of Old Testament prophecy. For a Jew writing to Jewish-Christians in the earliest ages of Christianity such an omission is incomprehensible. The insistence on the Messiahship of our Lord would be the first step in the propagation of the faith among Jews; and if an Epistle of this length and comprehensive character in the subjects touched upon had been written by St. James he could scarcely have omitted some reference, though but a passing one, to the Messiah Whom he had seen and known. The question as to whether our Lord was the promised Messiah or not was one which was naturally surging in the minds of Jews in those early days; the question, "Art Thou He that should come?" perplexed the minds of many others long after the time of the Baptist; for Jews it was all-important, for everything depended upon it. The fact, therefore, that the Messiahship of Jesus is taken for granted in the Epistle (see i. 1, ii. 1) proves that these Jews of the Dispersion regarded this truth as axiomatic; and this would be almost impossible to understand among Jews of the *Dispersion* in the earliest ages of Christianity, if the conditions of the time are taken into consideration; the only way whereby this could be brought within the bounds of probability would be to restrict the meaning of *Dispersion*, but this would be arbitrary and without justification, seeing that in our Epistle the word is used without qualification, and, therefore, evidently intended to mean what was ordinarily understood by it.

A further objection urged against the authorship of St. James is the improbability of one in such a humble walk in life as a Galilæan peasant, the son of Mary and Joseph, being able to pen an Epistle of this kind in Greek. The writer of the Epistle displays a considerable knowledge of the Greek *Wisdom* literature, of various N.T. books, and of other Greek writings. It may be said in reply that opportunities for learning Greek were not wanting in Palestine, and the fact of humble birth was certainly no hindrance to the acquiring of knowledge among the Jews. But in a case like this, in which proof either for or against is not forthcoming, one must to a large extent be guided by a balance of probabilities. As far as our knowledge goes

there was really nothing to induce St. James to learn Greek; there is no evidence for supposing that he extended his evangelistic efforts beyond the confines of Palestine; on the contrary, the evidence is in the other direction; as overseer of the Church in Jerusalem his activity must have been almost, if not altogether, exercised among those of his own race. Moreover, it is certain that the Palestinian Jewish teachers altogether discouraged everything that tended to the spread and influence of the Greek spirit, for they rightly (from their point of view) regarded it as a menace to orthodox Judaism (see Bergmann, *Jüdische Apologetik im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, p. 80, etc.); and for a Jew to go to heathen assemblies to learn was, to say the least, improbable in Palestine. As an apostle of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 9) in Palestine the various dialects of the Palestinian vernacular were amply sufficient for St. James' purposes. It must also be confessed that, even granting that St. James knew Greek, the large acquaintance with some of the Pauline Epistles which the writer of our Epistle shows is against the authorship of St. James; for how was St. James to gain such an intimate knowledge of these without having them before him? It is certain that in those early days there were not many copies of them, and whatever copies there were would be needed outside of Palestine rather than inside; nor is it quite clear why St. James should have required them at all. These Epistles must have been treasured by the Churches addressed as their special possession; copies of them are not likely to have been circulated generally until they had become authoritative documents in the Church at large, and this can scarcely have been the case until close upon the end of the first century at the earliest. The two Epistles that come into consideration are *Romans*, written from Corinth in c. 58 A.D., and *Galatians*, probably slightly earlier, perhaps from Antioch (or Ephesus?); these are the earliest dates that can be assigned to them, and as St. James was martyred probably in 63 A.D., there certainly does not appear to have been sufficient time for them to have reached that stage of importance in the eyes of Christians generally for copies to have been circulated outside of the particular congregations addressed. This argument does not appeal, of course, to those who hold that St. Paul was indebted to St. James' Epistle. On the other hand, the analogy of the letter inspired by St. James in Acts xv. suggests the possibility that something of the same kind may have been repeated; but in this case we should look for something more homogeneous than the Epistle (in its entirety) which at present bears his name.

Turning now more specifically to the question of *date*, we have, firstly, the entire absence of any reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. This can either imply that the Epistle was written some time before that event, or else some considerable time after. It is an argument which is conclusive neither for an early nor for a late date, and can only be used to emphasise the correctness of a result, concerning the date, reached on other grounds. There is, however, one consideration which suggests (though it certainly cannot be said to amount to proof) an early date; the words in v. 7-9, especially "stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord is at hand," are, in view of such a passage as Mark xiii. 14-37—see especially verses 28 ff.—more natural from one who was writing before the Fall of Jerusalem. Again, the silence in our Epistle regarding the great controversy on the question of the admission of Gentiles into the Church may well be used as an argument in favour of an early date, though it may also imply the opposite. Silence on this subject, which clearly agitated the Church to such an extent as to shake the very pillars (*cf.* Gal. ii. 11 ff.) can only be satisfactorily explained on one of two hypotheses; either the Epistle was written before this controversy arose, or else it was not written until so long after that there was no occasion to refer to it. It is, therefore, an argument which can be used both in favour of an early and a late date, and is thus, like that just referred to, inconclusive. But see further on this below. In the next place, the *data* to be gathered from the Epistle as to the *order and constitution of the Church* are important in seeking to fix an approximate date. The meeting-place for worship of the Jewish-Christians to whom the Epistle is addressed is called the "Synagogue"; from this it has been argued that the Epistle was written at a time when Christian and Jewish places of worship had not yet become differentiated; if, it is said, the Epistle had been written, say, during the first half of the second century, such place of meeting would have been termed ἐκκλησία. In reply to this, however, it can be urged that συναγωγή is used of a distinctively Christian assembly, *e.g.*, by Hermas in *Mand.*, xi. 9. Again, in iii. 1 mention is made of "many teachers," and in v. 14 of the "elders (or presbyters) of the Church" (τῆς ἐκκλησίας); that no reference is made to "bishops" or "deacons" points to an undeveloped constitution of the Church, and therefore to an early date for the Epistle; moreover, the expression "many teachers" may imply a time when regular church officers for this purpose had not yet been ordained. But, on the other hand, it can be argued that the existence of "elders of the Church" does point to an organised system, and that

the "many teachers" is better understood at a time when the number of Christians had greatly increased. Here, again, the argument on either side is inconclusive. Once more, *the condition of the Churches* to which the Epistle is addressed has not unnaturally been pointed to as not suggestive of the very early years of Christianity; the earnestness and zeal which one might expect in those of the first generation of Christians is conspicuously lacking among those addressed; the impression gained as to the characteristics of these is disappointing—the unbridled tongue, worldliness, quarrelling, jealousy, a mercenary spirit, despising of the poor, flattering the rich, lust, and an entire absence of the wisdom that is from above, with the virtues which this brings in its train. This argument is extremely well answered by Mayor (pp. cxxviii. ff.), who gives a number of examples showing that a similar state of morals was exhibited in other newly-formed Christian communities; but his answer is not conclusive, for some of the examples cited—Ananias and Sapphira, Simon—are so obviously exceptional; others, such as the murmuring of Hellenistic Jews against the Hebrews because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration, and the jealousy between Jews and Gentiles mentioned in Acts xv., and the case of those who had not heard "whether there be any Holy Ghost," are not, strictly speaking, analogous. Moreover, a difference must be made between recently converted Jews and those among the Gentiles who became Christians; among the former there had always been a previous training in moral discipline, which was not the case with the Gentiles; the characteristics, therefore, alluded to above, which are spoken of in reference to Jewish-Christians sound stranger than if Gentile-Christians were in question. If, on the other hand, the Epistle—or those parts of it which come into consideration in this connection—was written after Christianity had been established for two or three generations, the conditions described would be more comprehensible.

The conditions just referred to must, in part, have been the cause of the predominantly *ethical character of the Epistle;* morals rather than religion sound the dominant note, and for an Epistle like this to have been written during the Apostolic age, when religious fervour was so pronounced, is certainly a little difficult of explanation. The attempts to solve this problem which have been made only bring into relief the incongruousness of the need of such a tone in an Epistle written in the middle (or shorty after the middle) of the first century; for it differs utterly in this respect from other Apostolic writings. It is, of course, true to say that "no Apostolic writing fails to exhibit

the moral interest as the consistent aim of all doctrine and instruction; the appeal for conduct corresponding to the new teaching is the regular conclusion of all doctrinal exposition";[1] but the Apostles, as the same writer truly observes, always start from "the new revelation of the nature of man's dependence on God and God's work in man, which was contained in the Life, the Death, the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus,"[2] and this is just what is left aside—or perhaps, more correctly, taken for granted—in our Epistle; but in an Apostolic writing we legitimately look for the foundation-truths to be at least as prominent as the ethical standard which is based upon them. The argument based on this fact speaks for a late date. Next, a subject already dealt with, namely, the *Judaic tone* of the Epistle, is sometimes put forward in favour of an early date; but this characteristic could be used in support of any date from 200 B.C.-200 A.D., to give the narrowest margin; the argument, therefore, is wholly inconclusive. More to the point is that based upon the mention of the *Diaspora*. For the "twelve tribes of the Dispersion" to be addressed presupposes a widely-spread Christianity, such as would require many years to permit it to have developed itself, so that the use of the phrase in reference to Jewish-Christians almost compels one to postulate a late date for the bulk of the Epistle. The only reply forthcoming to refute this contention is to restrict the meaning of the term "Dispersion"; but, as already pointed out above, the Epistle gives us no authority for this, and what the Jews meant by the twelve tribes of the Dispersion is so well known that this reply ought scarcely to be considered. Then, on the other hand, the absence of all reference to the Temple and its worship has been used as an argument that the Temple no more existed, and that therefore the Epistle must at any rate be later than the year 70 A.D. This argument, however, seems quite inconclusive, for, unless for some specific purpose, why should it be mentioned in an Epistle to Jewish-Christians?

Finally, it is worth inquiring whether the silence of the Epistle concerning the two great distinctive marks of Judaism—*viz.*, Circumcision and the Sabbath—throws any light upon the question of date. The opinion had been directly expressed by St. James that circumcision was unnecessary for Gentile-Christians (Acts xv. 19, *cf.* xv. 5); on the other hand, Jewish-Christians would, of course, have been circumcised, in the first generation; but there must have arisen at an early stage the question as to whether the children of Jewish-Christians should be circumcised or not; it can hardly be doubted

[1] Parry, *A Discussion of the General Epistle of St. James*, p. 93.
[2] *Ibid.*

that the congregations in the Dispersion to whom our Epistle was addressed comprised a certain number of Gentile- as well as Jewish-Christians, and the latter must have known that the former were not circumcised, neither they nor their children, and therefore the question must have arisen as to which was the right course; it was a subject with which St. Paul had had to deal (1 Cor. vii. 18); as soon as the two classes of Christians began to associate, it must have become necessary to have some uniformity in this matter; it concerned the children more especially. On the assumption of an early date for the Epistle one might almost have a right to expect some reference to the question on account of its importance in the eyes of Jews, whereas on the assumption of a late date, when the usage of non-circumcision had been in vogue for some time, the silence on the subject would be natural. It is, perhaps, worth while pointing out that the question was probably to some extent complicated by the fact that baptism, as well as circumcision, was practised among the Jews, as regards proselytes, both before and after the founding of Christianity; during the first centuries of Christianity it became a burning question among the Rabbis whether circumcision without baptism was sufficient; some maintained that baptism alone sufficed. These were things concerning which the scattered congregations of the Dispersion must, in these early years of the planting of the faith, have needed guidance. As regards the Sabbath, some authoritative expression of opinion would also seem to have been demanded if the Epistle were of early date; those who had only comparatively recently become Christians might be expected to have required some guidance as to the observance of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day; even if both were observed, as was probably the case among the early Jewish-Christians, questions as to the relative importance of each can scarcely have been wanting when one remembers the punctiliousness in all that concerns observances which is so characteristic of the Jew. The silence on these two subjects is, of course, inconclusive as to date; all that can be said is that, assuming an early date for the Epistle, some reference to them might reasonably be expected, while if it were written about 125-130 A.D. this silence would be natural.

The net result, then, of these considerations as to authorship and date appears to be as follows: A great deal is to be said in favour of St. James' authorship, and, therefore, in favour of an early date; at least as much is to be said in favour of a late date (say the first or second quarter of the second century), and, therefore, against the authorship of St. James. Against every argument adduced in favour of either view serious objections can be urged; but then these

objections, again, can for the most part be upset by counter-arguments. In view of such a perplexing state of affairs it is extremely difficult, perhaps impossible, to reach a satisfactory conclusion ; one thing is quite clear, and that is, that the advocates of either contention have a great deal to urge in support of their position, and that, therefore, dogmatic assertion regarding either is precarious, and belittling of the adversaries' arguments uncalled for. Any conclusion reached must, for the present, be tentative ; and, therefore, the view here held is provisional—the view, that is to say, that the name of St. James attaching to the Epistle is authentic, but that, in the first instance, the Epistle was a great deal shorter than as we now possess it ; sections being added from time to time, probably excerpts from other writings, or adaptations of these. Indeed, it is possible that we have here something in the shape of text and commentary, the latter being enlarged as time went on. If one remembers how, on an infinitely larger scale, of course, the comments of the words of Scripture by degrees became the *Mishna*, the comments on these the *Gemara*, and how ultimately the ponderous mass known as the *Talmud* came into being, the possibility of this intensely Jewish Epistle having grown by a process of comments, which ultimately came to be regarded as part of the Epistle itself, will be realised. One or two tentative examples of the supposed process will be given in III. on the analysis of the Epistle. This view does not profess to be anything more than theory, it is probably incapable of proof ; but it has, at least, the merit of justifying the position both of those who advocate an early as well as those who believe in a late date for the Epistle.

II. Literary Characteristics.—These have to a large extent been already dealt with ; but a brief reference to three other points is demanded on account of their special importance.

(i.) One of the most striking features of the Epistle is the extended acquaintance with the *Wisdom* literature which it exhibits. Many instances of this will be found in the Commentary, here it must suffice to indicate by references some of the more important and striking examples ; the following passages should be compared together : **i. 5**, Sir. i. 1, 26, Wisd. vi. 14, vii. 14, 15 ; **i. 8**, Sir. i. 28, ii. 12, v. 9 ; **i. 12**, Wisd. v. 16 ; **i. 13**, Sir. xv. 11-15 (especially in the Hebrew original), xv. 20 ; **i. 19**, Sir. v. 11 (the words "and let thy life be sincere," which are inserted by A.V., are found neither in the Hebrew nor the Greek ; their absence makes the agreement between the words in Jas. and this passage closer), i. 29, iv. 29, v. 13 ; **i. 27**, Sir. vii. 34-36, *cf.* iv. 10 ; **ii. 6**, Wisd. ii. 10 (in the Greek) ; **iii. 2**,

Sir. xiv. 1, xix. 16, xxv. 8, xxxvii. 18; **iii. 5, 6,** Sir. v. 13, 14, viii. 3 xxviii. 11; **iii. 8,** Sir. xxviii. 16-18; **iii. 10,** Sir. xxviii. 12 (see also context); **iii. 13, 17,** Wisd. vii. 22-24; **v. 4,** Sir. iv. 1-6, xxxiv. 22; **v. 7,** Sir. vi. 19; **v. 16,** Sir. iv. 26; **v. 17,** Sir. xlviii. 3 (*cf.* context). These are very far from being exhaustive, and only two books of the *Wisdom* literature have been referred to, whereas points of contact are to be found in several others. This knowledge and sympathy with the *Wisdom* literature suggest a Hellenistic rather than a Palestinian Jew.

(ii.) A second literary characteristic, and one which is further indicative of Hebraic colouring (see above), is to be found in the large number of parallelisms which the Epistle contains. This well-known Hebrew literary characteristic appears sometimes more clearly than at others in the Epistle, but a few of the most obvious examples are the following:—

i. 9, 10[a]. *Let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate;*
And the rich in that he is made low.

i. 15. *Then the lust, having conceived, beareth sin;*
And the sin, being full-grown, bringeth forth death.

i. 17. *Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above,*
Coming down from the Father of lights,
With Whom can be no variation,
Nor shadow that is cast by turning.

i. 19, 20. *But let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath;*
For the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.

i. 22. *Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only,*
Deluding your own selves.

iii. 11, 12. *Doth the fountain send forth from the same opening sweet and bitter water?*
Can a fig tree, my brethren, yield olives, or a vine figs?

See, further, iv. 7, 10, v. 4, 5, 9. This, too, is in the style of much of the *Wisdom* literature, and reminds one often of the Book of Proverbs especially.

(iii.) Lastly, one cannot fail to be struck by the number of words —a large number when the shortness of the Epistle is considered— which are either ἅπ. λεγ. in the New Testament, or very rarely found, outside the Epistle, in the Septuagint or New Testament; this denotes a knowledge of Greek literature and of the Greek language generally, which is very noticeable; attention is drawn to such words

in the Commentary whenever they occur. For other literary characteristics see I. § 2.

III. Analysis of the Epistle.—The vast majority of commentators are agreed that no consistent scheme is presented in this Epistle, but that it contains rather a number of unconnected sayings which are for the most part independent of one another. The analysis of the Epistle shows the correctness of this view in the main.[1] In some cases it is possible that a thought-connection of a secondary character exists which is not at once apparent; by a thought-connection of a secondary character is meant, when in two succeeding sections a subordinate, not the main, thought of the earlier is taken up and dealt with in the later; an example may be seen in the two sections i. 2-4, i. 5-8; the main thought in the former is the being joyful in temptations, the subject of patience is a subordinate thought, and still more so, that of lacking in nothing; but it is this last which is taken up in the succeeding section and attached to the thought of lacking in wisdom; so that, although it is perfectly true to say there is no genuine connection between these two sections, yet there is a secondary connection. It is improbable that the two sections come from the same writer, because they are lacking in real mental sequence; and yet a semblance of sequence is apparent; if both came from the same writer one would either expect a genuine sequence of thought if the two were intended to be connected, or else a clear indication of each being self-contained. As they stand, it looks as though the former were a text, and the latter a comment upon it, very much like the similar process which occurs incessantly in the *Mishna*.[2] The next section, i. 9-11, deals with the subject of rich and poor; it stands in an isolated position here, but is intimately connected with the later section, ii. 1-13. With i. 12-16 we have another instance of what looks like text and comment; the subject is that of temptation, and comes most naturally after i. 4; the text is contained in ver. 12, the following verses then comment on the nature of temptation. This is an instructive instance illustrative of the theory of the authorship of the Epistle here tentatively advocated (see above); for on comparing the simple, straightforward character of ver. 12 with the intricate chain of thought in the two following verses, it is almost impossible to postulate identity of authorship.

[1] Parry's attempt to show that the Epistle is "a very careful and logical exposition of a single theme" (*op. cit.* p. 6) is ingenious, but much too artificial to carry conviction.

[2] Catch-words, it would seem, played their part in the formation and grouping of sections.

i. 17 belongs to the preceding, possibly (see IV. § 1), and i. 18 seems to be a comment on the "Father of lights". i. 19b-20 forms an isolated saying. A self-contained section on the subject of practical religion follows in i. 21-25, to which vv. 26, 27 form an addition. ii. 1-13 has already been referred to; it is followed by a section (ii. 14-26) of deep interest on the subject of faith and works, to which iii. 13-18 belong, according to the subject-matter. iii. 1-12 is a self-contained passage dealing with the subject of self-control as regards the tongue. If these first three chapters show a want of homogeneity, the last two do so in an even more pronounced way; the various sections are clearly divided off, showing no connection with each other, the whole forming a collection of extracts, apparently; thus, iv. 1-10 contains warnings and exhortations concerning the practical religious life; iv. 11, 12 is a short section on the need of observing the second great commandment of the Law; iv. 13-17 lays stress on the uncertainty and fleeting character of earthly life; v. 1-11 is an eschatological section, and extremely practical; v. 12, which prohibits swearing, is almost a quotation from the Sermon on the Mount; v. 13-18 gives directions concerning the visitation of the sick; and the abrupt ending v. 19, 20 speaks of the reward of those who convert sinners from their evil ways.

It will thus be seen that the Epistle is for the most part a collection of independent sections; some of these were evidently originally intended to be comments on the Apostle's words, possibly added by one or more of the elders of the churches addressed for the benefit of the members; others seem to be wholly independent, and not to have had anything to do with the Epistle in the first instance. The various elements of which the Epistle is now composed have to a large extent become so intermingled that the attempt to differentiate between them seems hopeless. But, generally speaking, we should look for the simplest, most direct and straightforward parts as being those which would be the most likely words of the Apostle; so that such parts as i. 13-16 and ii. 14-26 can hardly be regarded as from the same hand as, *e.g.*, ii. 1-13 (in the main).

IV. Some Jewish Doctrines Considered.—As is often mentioned in the notes, there are some points of Jewish theology which figure rather prominently in this Epistle; there are above all two subjects, specifically Jewish, which play an important part, and therefore a brief consideration of these will not be out of place here:—

(i.) *The Jewish doctrine of the Yetser hara'*.—Speculations as to the origin of sin were rife among Jewish thinkers at all times; the perplexity which is so plainly apparent in the words of St. Paul

(Rom. vii. 22-23), *For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members*, had been felt by many long before his day. The origin of the existence of the "law of sin in the members," which asserted itself in spite of the ardent desire of men to be free from its power, was the great problem which had to be solved. The result was the theory, based upon the observed facts of experience, that within man, as part of his created being, there were two tendencies: the tendency towards good, *Yetser ha-tob* (יצר הטוב), and the tendency towards evil, *Yetser hara'* (יצר הרע). But whence originated these two tendencies? If they both formed part of man's nature from the beginning, it followed that their creation was due to God; there was, of course, no difficulty about ascribing the creation of the good tendency to Him, but that He should have created anything evil was obviously a difficulty. The varying thoughts and speculations on the subject will perhaps best be seen by giving a few illustrations as examples. In Sir. xv. 14, 15, we have these interesting words, according to the Greek Version: "He made man from the beginning, and left him in the power of his will" (ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίου αὐτοῦ); "if thou willest, thou wilt observe the commandments, and to exhibit faithfulness is a matter of thy good pleasure" (καὶ πίστιν ποιῆσαι εὐδοκίας); the significance of these words is only realised when they are read in the Hebrew, *viz.*, "God [this is the reading of the Syriac and Latin as well] created man from the beginning; and He delivered him into the hand of him who took him for a prey (חותפו); and He gave him over into the power of his will (יצרו)"; here it is clear that the second clause is an explanatory gloss (it is wanting in the Greek), the object being to indicate that to be in the power of the *Yetser* (which is here clearly used in reference to the *evil* tendency) is equivalent to being in the power of Satan. This is important as showing that the evil tendency is not ascribed to divine creation, but that over against the good which God created in man there is an opposition of evil which is due to the activity of Satan. This thought of opposing tendencies is apparent elsewhere in the same book, *e.g.*, xxxiii. 15: "Good is set against evil, and life against death; so is the godly against the sinner. So look upon all the works of the Most High; there are two and two, one against another" (the Hebrew of these verses is not extant); here the writer comes perilously near ascribing the creation of evil to God; but in another passage the question is left

open, xxxvii. 3: "O evil tendency (יצר רע), why wast thou made to fill the earth with thy deceit?" It is, at all events, not directly ascribed to God; these pathetic words remind one of those of St. Paul in Rom. vii. 24. The same hesitation to assert that God created evil is observable in a curious passage from the pseudepigraph called *The Life of Adam and Eve* (*Apocalpyse of Moses*), § 19;[1] this describes the origin of evil, and tells of how in the garden of Eden Satan took the form of an angel, but spoke "through the mouth of the Serpent," and aroused within Eve the desire to eat of the fruit of the tree that stood in the middle of the garden; first of all, however, we are told that he made her swear that she would give of the fruit to Adam as well; then the text goes on: "When he (*i.e.*, the Serpent) had, then, made me swear, he came and ascended up into it (*i.e.*, the tree). But in the fruit which he gave me to eat he placed the poison of his malice, namely, of his lust; for lust is the beginning of all sin. And he [other authorities read "I"] bent down the bough to the earth, then I took of the fruit and ate." Here the origin of evil *in man* is satisfactorily accounted for; its existence in Satan is taken for granted, and no attempt is made to follow it up further back. Noticeable here, too, is the way in which lust is brought into connection with the origin of sin; this is an idea which seems to have been widely prevalent in Jewish circles, the lust of Satan towards Eve being described as the beginning of sin in the world (See *Sanhedrin*, 59 *b*; *Sotah*, 9 *b*; *Jebamoth*, 103 *b*; *Abodah Zara*, 22 *b*; *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 18, 19); so that it is very interesting to read in our Epistle, after i., 13, 14 (which will be referred to presently), in which the impulse to sin in man is dealt with, the words: ". . . when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed. Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin; and the sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death". This thought of a relationship between sin and death is graphically illustrated in the *Jerusalem Targum* to Gen. iii. 6, where it is said that at the moment in which Eve succumbed to temptation she caught sight of Sammael, the angel of death. Other theories as to the origin of sin were that it was brought into existence by man, *e.g.*, Enoch xcviii. 4, "Sin has not been sent upon the earth, but man himself has created it," this is the teaching, apparently, in Jas. i. 14; in ch. lxxxv. of the same book it is taught that fallen angels were the originators of sin (*cf. Bereshith Rabba*, c. 24; *Yalkut Shim. Beresh.*, 42). None of these theories was,

[1] The two works run parallel to a large extent.

however, satisfactory; none really gave the answer to the problem that was constantly presenting itself; if, for a moment, the contention was put forth that man himself originated sin, a very little thought showed that this, too, was untenable, for the very nature of the "evil tendency" forbade the idea that man could have created it. Therefore, at a very early period, comparatively speaking, the teaching which afterwards became crystallised in Rabbinical writings, must have been put forth,—the logical, if dangerous, doctrine, that God, as the Creator of all things, must have also created the *Yetser hara'*, the "evil tendency"; thus in *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 27, it is definitely stated that God created the *Yetser hara'*; in *Yalkut Shim. Beresh.*, 44-47, the Almighty is made to say: "I grieve that I created man of earthly substance; for had I created him of heavenly substance he would not have rebelled against me"; again *ibid.* 61: "It repenteth me that I created the *Yetser hara'* in man, for had I not done this he would not have rebelled against me"; and in *Kiddushin*, 30*b*, we read: "I created an evil tendency (*Yetser ra'*). I created for him (*i.e.*, for man, in order to counteract this) the Law as a means of healing. If ye occupy yourselves with the Law, ye will not fall into the power of it (*i.e.*, the *Yetser ra'*). Once more, according to *Bammidbar Rabba*, c. 22, we are told of how God created the good and the evil tendencies: the former was placed in man's right side, the latter in his left side. In other passages it is pointed out that the *Yetser tob* is Wisdom and Knowledge of the Law (Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 218). The danger of such a doctrine is obvious, a danger which could not be more vividly illustrated than in the words of St. Paul, Rom. vii. 15-24: " . . . but if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the Law that it is good. So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. . . . but if what I would not, that I do, it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me, . . . "; that teaching like this, taken with the belief that the *evil tendency* was created by God, would be perverted was almost inevitable; it was the existence of such perversions which must have called forth the words in i. 13 f. of our Epistle: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, and He Himself tempteth no man . . . "; then, possibly, the words in verse 17 of the same chapter, "Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above . . . " refer to the *Yetser ha-tob*, and are intended to exclude the belief that the *Yetser hara'*, whereby men were tempted, came from God.

(ii.) *The Jewish Doctrine of Works.*—There are, according to

Rabbinical teaching, two categories of good works: i. *Mitzvôth* (מצוות) lit. "commandments"; these consist in observances of the *Torah;* ii. Works of love, of which the most important is almsgiving, indeed so high does this stand that it has the technical name of צדקה ("righteousness"); these two categories comprise the whole body of מעשׂים טובים ("good works"), the former representing man's duty to God, the latter His duty to His fellow-creatures; *cf.* Matt. xxii. 36-40, " . . . Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets." According to Jewish teaching, there are certain works of obligation; good works done over and above these are of free-will, and by these justification in the sight of God is attainable. There are two classes of men, those who do a sufficient number of good works to be justified in the sight of God—these are the צדיקים, "the righteous"—and those who do not—these are the רשׁעים, "the wicked"; these two are differentiated on earth, for it is said in *Sanhedrin*, 47 *a*, that a רשׁע may not be buried by the side of a צדיק. But besides these two classes, there is an intermediate one, the "ones between" (בינונים), who are half good and half bad; these can, by adding one good work, become reckoned among the "righteous" on the Day of Atonement (*Rôsh hashshana*, 16 *b*). The צדיקים—the "righteous"—were regarded as being in a state of זכות (*Zecûth*), which meant that their accumulation of good works was great enough to enable them to stand justified in the sight of God. In addition to this there was also the doctrine of זכות אבות ("merit of the fathers"), according to which the works of supererogation of departed ancestors went to the account of their descendants. The being in a state of *Zecûth* entitled a man, *per se*, to what was technically known as מתן שׂכר, lit. "the gift of reward" (*cf. Debarim rabba*, c. 2); and this applied to earthly reward as well as to reward hereafter. So that good works demanded reward from God; thus it is said in *Yalkut Shim. Beresh.*, 109, that it is by right that a man is rewarded with the good things in the Garden of Eden, because he has won them for himself. Justification by faith comes only so far into consideration in that it is reckoned among the מעשׂים טובים ("good works"), which, like all others, goes to swell the list of a man's מצוות, *cf.* Jas. ii. 24, "Ye see that by works a man is justified and not only by faith".

There is, at bottom, an intimate connection between the doctrine of the good and evil "tendency," dealt with above, and the doctrine of works; for it was by man's free-will that the good tendency was put into action which resulted in the accomplishment of good works; and it was by man's free-will that the evil tendency was resisted, and this constituted *per se* a *mitzvah*; *cf. Kiddushin*, 39 b, 40 a, where it is taught that the desire to do a *mitzvah* (*i.e.*, the calling of the good *Yetser* into action) is reckoned as though it were actually accomplished; and the temptation to do a sinful act (*i.e.*, the motion of the evil *Yetser*) if resisted likewise constitutes a *mitzvah*. It was, perhaps, almost inevitable that the danger would arise of taking merit for good deeds, *i.e.*, for exercising the good tendency, while repudiating responsibility for the often involuntary assertion of the evil tendency; that, however, the danger did arise does not admit of doubt; it was *naïvely* illogical, for while the exercise of the good tendency, resulting in good works, was regarded as solely due to human initiative—such a thing as "prevenient grace" did not come into account, *cf.* Eph. ii. 8-10—the evil tendency came to be looked upon as a human misfortune, and not of the nature of guilt in man, *cf.* Jas. i. 13, where this is combated.

These facts should be taken into consideration in seeking to realise the significance of some passages in our Epistle; thus, in i. 2-4, 12, we have Jewish teaching pure and simple, and the fact goes to substantiate the opinion that these verses, at all events, must be very early; one could not conceive them in the mouth of St. Paul, *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 13, Rom. ii. 4, whose teaching on this subject, though *apparently* more developed, is really fully in accordance with that of Christ;[1] on the other hand, we have in ii. 10 ("For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all") a principle which is certainly not that of normal Jewish teaching. On the very important section, ii. 14-26, see the notes in the Commentary, and what has been said above. Lastly, in v. 19, 20, we have again a thought which is especially Jewish; that a man should be able to "cover a multitude of sins" by virtue of his good deed is directly anti-Christian, because it makes the forgiveness of sins a matter which a man can effect, and thus wholly antagonistic to the doctrines of Grace and Atonement. On the word "to cover," the English equivalent for the Hebrew כפר, see *Church and Synagogue*, April 1908, pp. 43-45.

[1] As an example of this see the writer's article, "The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard," in the *Expositor*, April, 1908.

V. The Apparatus Criticus.—The following are the authorities, together with their abbreviations, which have been utilised :—

1. Uncials :—

ℵ Cod. Sinaiticus (iv. cen.).
ב Cod. Patiriensis (v. cen.), containing only iv. 14-v. 20.
A Cod. Alexandrinus (v. cen.).
B Cod. Vaticanus (iv. cen.).
C Cod. Ephraemi (v. cen.), wanting from Jas. iv. 3 to the end.
K_2 Cod. Mosquensis (ix. cen.), cited as K.
L_2 Cod. Angelicus Romanus (ix. cen.), cited as L.
P_2 Cod. Porfirianus (ix. cen.), cited as P; much illegible in Jas. ii. 13-21.

2. Cursives :—

Cited by their numbers, but only when they offer readings of interest; curss = the consensus of a number of cursives.

3. Versions :—

The Old Latin :—

m the pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum* (viii. or ix. cen.).
ff Cod. Corbeiensis (vi. cen.).
s Frag. Vindobonensia (vi. cen.); wanting in v. 11-20.

The Vulgate :—

The two most important MSS. are :—
$Vulg^A$ Cod. Amiatinus (viii. cen.).
$Vulg^F$ Cod. Fuldensis (vi. cen.).
Latt = the consensus of the Latin versions.

The Syriac Versions :—

Pesh = Peshiṭṭâ (belongs to the first half of the v. cen.).
Syr^{lec} = A Syriac Lectionary written in the dialect most probably used by our Lord (vi. cen.). Of Jas. it contains only i. 1-12.
Syr^{hk} = The Harklean Syriac (vii. cen.).
Syrr = the consensus of the Syriac versions.

The Armenian Version (v. cen.).*
The Coptic (Bohairic) *Version* (vi.-vii. cen.).*
The Ethiopic Version (iv. cen.).*
The Sahidic Version (iii. cen.).*

4. Church Fathers:—

Cyr = Cyril of Alexandria (v. cen.).
Dam = John Damascene (viii. cen.).
Did = Didymus of Alexandria (iv. cen.).
Oec = Oecumenius (xi. cen.).
Orig = Origen (iii. cen.).
Thl = Theophylact (xi. cen.).

5. Printed Editions:—

rec = Textus Receptus.
Ti = Tischendorf.
Treg = Tregelles.
WH = Westcott and Hort.
W = Weiss.

The Greek text used in the following pages is that published by Nestle, 1907.

VI. Literature.—The following selected list of Commentaries, etc., only takes account of the more recent works; for a full bibliography recourse must be had to Mayor's enumeration:—

Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, 1887.
Beyschlag, *Der Brief des Jacobus*, 1888.
Plummer, *St. James*, in the "Expositor's Bible," 1891.
Weiss, *Die Katholischen Briefe* . . . 1892.
Spitta, *Der Brief des Jakobus*, 1898.
„ *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, ii., 1896.
Von Soden, *Hand-Commentar* . . . 1899.
Parry, *A Discussion of the General Epistle of St. James*, 1903.
Grafe, *Die Stellung und Bedeutung des Jakobusbriefes in der Entwickelung des Urchristenthums*, 1904.
Knowling, *The Epistle of St. James*, in the "Westminster Commentaries," 1904.
Carr, *The Epistle of St. James*, in the "Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges," 1905.

* These dates refer to the century in which the versions were probably first made, not to any extant MSS. of them.

Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, 1906.
Patrick, *James, the Lord's Brother*, 1906.

See also the *Introductions* of Salmon, Scrivener, Weiss, Zahn, Holtzmann, and Gregory.

The following is a selection of some valuable articles:—

Adeney, in the *Critical Review*, July, 1896.
Brückner, in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1874.
Cone, in *Encycl. Bibl.* art. "James (Epistle)".
Fulford, in Hastings' *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, art. "James".
Moffatt, in the *Expos. Times*, xiii. pp. 201-206, "The Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees".
Mayor, in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, artt. "James," "James, General Epistle of".
Sieffert, in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, art. "Jacobus".
Simcox, in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1901.
Von Soden, in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1884.
Weiss, in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, May, June, 1904.

But perhaps of the greatest help of all are the many side-lights to be gathered from the study of such works as the following:—

Bergmann, *Jüdische Apologetik im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 1908.
Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 1903.[1]
Büchler, *Der galiläische 'Am-ha'Ares des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, 1906.
Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1908.
„ *The Book of Enoch*, 1893.
Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898.
Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 1895.
„ *Neue Bibelstudien*, 1897.
Fiebig's series of *Ausgewählte Mischnatractate*, 1905, etc.
Friedländer, *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judenthums im Zeitalter Jesu*, 1905.
Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (Engl. trans. by Moffatt) 1908.
Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1906.

[1] A new edition of this book has appeared.

Resch, *Agrapha*, 1906.

Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (Engl. trans. by Macpherson, Taylor, and Christie), 1890, etc.[1]

Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus-Sirach*, 1906.

Taylor's edition of *Pirqe Aboth*, "Sayings of the Jewish Fathers," 1897.

Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*, 1897.

The Talmudical works of Wünsche, Bacher, Strack, Fiebig, etc.

[1] A new edition of this work has appeared.

ΙΑΚΩΒΟΥ.[1]

I. 1. [a]**ΙΑΚΩΒΟΣ Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**[2] [b]**δοῦλος ταῖς δώδεκα** [c]**φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ** [d]**διασπορᾷ**[3] [e]**χαίρειν.**

a Acts xii. 17; *cf.* Matt. xiii. 55.
b Rom. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude i.; *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 16; 2 Tim. ii. 24.
c Luke xxii. 30; Acts xxvi. 17; *cf.* Matt. xix. 28.
d Deut. xxxii. 26; 1 Pet. i. 1; John vii. 35; *cf.* Acts ii. 5-11, viii. 1, xv. 23, xxiii. 6.
e 2 Macc. ix. 19; Acts xv. 23.

[1] Inscr. + **επιστολη** BKP, curss., om. **א επιστολη καθολικη του αγιου αποστολου ιακωβου** L, Epistola Catholica beati Jacobi Apostoli Vulg. (Epistulae Catholicae Vulg^{A}), **επ. του απ. ιακωβου** Pesh.

[2] דמרן Pesh., Syr$^{lec.}$ [3] Add דישראל להלין Syr$^{lec.}$

CHAPTER I.—Ver. 1. **Ἰάκωβος**: A very common name among Palestinian Jews, though its occurrence does not seem to be so frequent in pre-Christian times. Some noted Jewish Rabbis of this name lived in the earliest centuries of Christianity, notably Jacob ben Korshai, a "Tanna" (*i.e.*, "teacher" of the Oral Law) of the second century. The English form of the name comes from the Italian Giacomo. **θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: Only **Κυρίου** here can refer to Christ; in Gal. i. 1 the differentiation is made still more complete **. . . διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.** On the other hand, in John xx. 28, we have **ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου.** But the disjunctive use of **καὶ** in the words before us does not imply a withholding of the divine title from our Lord, for the usage of **Κύριος** in the N.T., especially without the article, when connected with **Χριστός,** is in favour of its being regarded as a divine title, see *e.g.*, 1 Cor. i. 1-3, etc. Hellenistic Jews used **Κύριος** as a name for God; the non-use of the article gains in significance when it is remembered that **ὁ Κύριος,** "Dominus," was a title given to the early Roman Emperors in order to express their deity, *cf.* Acts xxv. 26, where Festus refers to Nero as **ὁ Κύριος.** The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary (containing, as generally conceded, the dialect which our Lord spoke), as well as the Peshittâ, read "Our Lord," the expression used in the Peshittâ in Matt. viii. 25, **Κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα,** and in xx. 33, **Κύριε, ἵνα ἀνοιγῶσιν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν**; both instances of divine power being exercised. **Χριστοῦ**: the use of this title, applied to Jesus without further comment, speaks against an early date for the Epistle; in a letter written to *Jews* during the apostolic age it is inconceivable that the Messiah should be referred to in this connection without some justification; Jewish beliefs concerning the Messiah were such as to make it impossible for them to accept Jesus as the Messiah without some teaching on the subject; this would be the more required in the case of Jews of the Dispersion who could not have had the same opportunities of learning the truths of Christianity as Palestinian Jews. The way in which the title is here applied to our Lord implies that the truth taught was already generally accepted. The absence of the article also points to a late date. **δοῦλος**: Generally speaking, to the Jew **δοῦλος** (עֶבֶד), when used in reference to God, meant a *worshipper*, and when used with reference to men a *slave;* as the latter sense is out of the question here, **δοῦλος** must be understood as meaning worshipper, in which case the deity of our Lord would appear to be distinctly implied. **ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ**: the "twelve tribes" was merely a synonym for the Jewish race (**ἔθνος Ἰουδαίων**), but there was a real

f Phil. iii. 1; *cf.* Matt. v. 12.
g 1 Pet. i. 6.
h Rom. v. 4; 1 Pet. i. 7.

2. Πᾶσαν χαρὰν [f]ἡγήσασθε, ἀδελφοί μου, ὅταν [g]πειρασμοῖς [1] περιπέσητε ποικίλοις, 3. γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὸ [h]δοκίμιον [2] ὑμῶν [3] τῆς

[1] Add סגיאא Pesh. [2] δοκιμον 28a. [3] Om. Syrlec.

distinction between the Jews of the Dispersion and the Palestinian Jews. The latter were for the most part peasants or artisans, while the former, congregated almost wholly in cities, were practically all traders (*cf.* iv. 13). In each case there was a restricted circle of the learned. The connection of the Diaspora-Jews with Palestine became less and less close, until at last it consisted of little more than the payment of the annual Temple dues; with very many one visit in a lifetime to Jerusalem sufficed, and this was of course entirely discontinued after the Destruction, when the head-quarters of Jewry became centred in the Rabbinical academy of Jabne. From the present point of view, it is very important to bear in mind, above all, two points of difference between Palestinian and Diaspora-Jews, (1) Language, (2) Religion. (1) Among the former, Aramaic had displaced Hebrew; Aramaic was the language of everyday life, as well as of religion (hence the need of the Methurgeman to translate the Hebrew Scriptures in the Synagogues); among the latter Greek was spoken. It is not necessary to insist upon the obvious fact that this difference of language brought with it a corresponding difference of mental atmosphere; the Jew remained a Jew, but his way of thinking became modified. (2) Their contact with other peoples brought to the Diaspora-Jews a larger outlook upon the world; at the same time, they could not fail to see the immeasurable superiority of their faith over the heathen cults practised by others. This resulted on their laying greater stress on the essentials of their faith; the ethical side of their religion received greater emphasis, the spirituality of belief became more realised, and it therefore followed of necessity that universalistic ideas grew, so that proselytism became, at one time, a great characteristic among the Diaspora-Jews; Judaism contained a message to all peoples, it was felt; and thus the particularistic character of Palestinian Judaism found no place among the Diaspora-Jews. But, at the same time, the Bible of these Jews, which exercised an immense influence upon their thought and literature, was Hebraic in essence though clothed in Greek garb; hence that extraordinarily interesting phenomenon, the Hellenistic Jew. In view of what has been said it is interesting to note that two outstanding characteristics of the Epistle before us are: Hebraic thought and diction expressed in Greek form, and the emphasis laid on ethics rather than on doctrine. The meaning of **διασπορά** is quite unambiguous, and there is no justification for restricting it to the Eastern Dispersion; it includes the Jews of Italy, Macedonia, Greece, Asia Minor and, above all, Egypt, as well as of Asia. For further details see Esther iii. 8, viii. 9, ix. 30, x. 1; Acts ii. 9-11; *Syb. Orac.*, iii. 271; Josephus, *Antiq. XIV.*, vii. 12; *Contra Ap.*, i. 22, etc., etc. **χαίρειν**: *Cf.* Acts xv. 23, xxiii. 26, the only other occurrences of this form of salutation in the N.T. "Historically there is probably no ellipsis even in the epistolary **χαίρειν**" (Moulton, *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (1), p. 180). It is of interest to note that in the Epistle inspired by St. James (Acts xv. 23) this form of salutation is used; it would, however, be precarious to draw deductions as to authorship from this, for the use of the infinitive for the imperative is quite common in Hellenistic Greek; as Moulton says: "We have every reason to expect it in the N.T., and its rarity there is the only matter of surprise" (*Ibid.*). The Peshittâ and Syrlec have the Jewish form, *Shalôm*.

Ver. 2. **Πᾶσαν χαράν**: *Cf.* Phil. ii. 29, **μετὰ πάσης χαρᾶς**: the rendering in Syrlec, which is rather a paraphrase than a translation, catches the meaning admirably: בכל חדוא הוו חאדין אחי, "With all joy be rejoicing my brethren." **ἡγήσασθε**: the writer is not to be understood as meaning that these trials *are* joyful in themselves, but that as a means to beneficial results they are to be rejoiced in; it is the same thought as that contained in Heb. xii. 11: **πᾶσα μὲν παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι ἀλλὰ λύπης, ὕστερον δὲ καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς δι' αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδίδωσιν δικαιοσύνης.**

πίστεως [1] [j]κατεργάζεται [k]ὑπομονήν. 4. ἡ δὲ [2] ὑπομονὴ ἔργον [i]τέλειον ἐχέτω, [3] ἵνα ἦτε [l]τέλειοι καὶ [m]ὁλόκληροι, ἐν μηδενὶ λειπό-

i Rom. v. 3; *cf.* Luke xxi. 19. k Luke viii. 15; Rom ii. 7; Heb. x. 36; 2 Pet. i. 6; 2 Thess. i. 4. l *Cf.* iii. 2; Matt. v. 48. m Thess. v. 23.

[1] Om. της πιστεως B[3] (hab B[1]), 81, *ff*, Syr[hk]. [2] Om. Vulg[A].
[3] Some lat. MSS. read *habet* others *habeat*.

ἀδελφοί μου: this term of address was originally Jewish; in Hebrew, אח is used, in the first instance, of those born of the same mother, *e.g.*, Gen. iv. 2, etc.; then in a wider sense of a relative, *e.g.*, Gen. xiv. 12, etc.; and in the still more extended meaning of kinship generally, *e.g.*, of tribal membership, Num. xvi. 10; as belonging to the same people, *e.g.*, Exod. ii. 11; Lev. xix. 7, and even of a stranger (גֵּר) sojourning among the people, Lev. xix. 34; it is also used of those who have made a covenant together, Am. i. 9; and, generally, of friends, 2 Sam. i. 26, etc.; in its widest sense it was taken over by the Christian communities, whose members were both friends and bound by the same covenant (*cf.* the origin of the Hebrew word for "covenant," ברית, from the Assryo-Babylonian *Biritu* which means "a fetter"). This mode of address occurs frequently in this Epistle, sometimes the simple **ἀδελφοί** without **μου** (iv. 11, v. 7, 9, 10), sometimes with the addition of **ἀγαπητοί** (i. 16, 19, ii. 5). **πειρασμοῖς**: in vv. 12 ff. **πειρασμός** obviously means allurement to wrong-doing, and this would appear to be the most natural meaning here on account of the way in which temptation is analysed, though the sense of external trials, in the shape of calamity, would of course not be excluded; "it may be that the effect of external conditions upon character should be included in the term" (Parry). It is true that the exhortation to look upon temptations with joy is scarcely compatible with the prayer, "Lead us not into temptation" (Matt. vi. 13; Luke, xi. 4) or with the words, "Pray that ye enter not into temptation" (Matt. xxvi. 41; Luke xxii. 40; see too Mark xiv. 38; Luke xxii. 46; Rev. iii. 10); but, as is evident from a number of indications in this Epistle, the writer's Judaism is stronger than his Christianity, and owing to the Jewish doctrines of free-will and works, a Jew would regard temptation in a less serious light than a Christian (see Introduction § iv.). Most pointedly does Parry remark: "There is a true joy for the warrior when he meets face to face the foe whom he has been directed to subjugate, in a warfare that trains hand and eye and steels the nerve and tempers the will . . . "; this is precisely the Jewish standpoint; while the Christian, realising his sinfulness and inherent weakness, and grounded in a spirit of humility, reiterates the words which he has been taught in the Lord's Prayer. This passage is one of the many in the Epistle which makes it so difficult to believe that it can all have been written by St. James.—**περιπέσητε**: the connection in which this word stands in the few passages of the N.T. which contain it supports the idea that in **πειρασμοῖς** external trials are included (Luke x. 30; Acts xxvii. 41).—**ποικίλοις**: *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 6., **ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς**, Pesh. adds **πολλοῖς**, *cf.* 3 Macc. ii. 6, **ποικίλαις καὶ πολλαῖς δοκιμάσας τιμωρίαις.**

Ver. 3. **γινώσκοντες**: "recognising"; this seems to be the force of the word **γιγνώσκω** in Hellenistic Greek (see Lightfoot, *Ep. to the Galatians*, p. 171); if so, it comes very appositely after **ἡγήσασθε.—τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως**: according to instances of the use of the word **δοκίμιον** given by Deissmann (*Neue Bibelstudien*, pp. 187 ff.) it means "pure" or "genuine."; it is the neuter of the adjective used as a substantive, followed by a genitive; the phrase would thus mean; "That which is genuine in your faith worketh . . . "; this meaning of **δοκίμιον** makes 1 Pet. i. 7 clearer and more significant; *cf.* Prov. xxvii. 21 (Sept.); Sir. ii. 1 ff. On **πίστις** see ver. 6.—**κατεργάζεται**: emphatic form of **ἐργάζεται**, "accomplishes".—**ὑπομονήν**: the word here means "the frame of mind which endures," as distinct from the act of enduring which is the meaning of the word in 2 Cor. i. 6, vi. 4. Philo calls **ὑπομονή** the queen of virtues (see Mayor, *in loc.*), it is one which has probably been nowhere more fully exemplified than in the history of the Jewish race.

Ver. 4. **ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω**: "But let endurance have its perfect result"; the possibility

n 1 Kgs. iii. 9, xi. 12; Prov. ii. 3-6.
o Matt. vii. 7.
p Sir. i. 1, 26, xxxix. 6; Wisd. vi. 14, 22, vii. 13; *cf.* Job xxxii. 8; Prov. viii. 17, xxviii. 5.
q Rom. xii. 8.
r Sir. xli. 22.

n λειπεται σοφίας, o αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ p Θεοῦ l πᾶσιν q ἁπλῶς καὶ μὴ r ὀνειδίζοντος, καὶ δοθήσεται

l του Θεου του διδοντος A.

of losing heart is contemplated, which would result in something being lacking; the words recall what is said in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Jos. ii. 7. "For endurance (μακροθυμία) is a mighty charm, and patience (ὑπομονή) giveth many good things". *Cf.* Rom. v. 3.—ἵνα ἦτε τέλειοι: *Cf.* Matt. v. 48, xix. 21; see Lightfoot's note on the meaning of this word in Phil. iii. 15, "the τέλειοι are in fact the same with πνευματικοί" (*Ep. to the Philippians*, p. 153). That in the passage before us it does not mean perfect in the literal sense is clear from the words which occur in iii. 2 (assuming that the same writer wrote both passages), πολλὰ πταίομεν ἅπαντες. "The word τέλειος is often used by later writers of the baptised" (Mayor). —ὁλόκληροι: *Cf.* Wisd. xv. 3; in its root-meaning ὁλόκληρος implies the "entire lot or destiny," so that the underlying idea regarding a man who is ὁλόκληρος means one who fulfils his lot; here it would mean 'those who fully attain to their high calling'. — ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι: this is merely explanatory of ὁλόκληροι.

Ver. 5. There is no thought-connection between this verse and what has preceded, it is only by supplying something artificially that any connection can be made to exist, and for this there is no warrant in the text as it stands (see Introduction III.). In ver. 4 ὑπομονή has as its full result the making perfect of men, so that they are lacking in nothing; when, therefore, the next verse goes on to contemplate a lacking of wisdom, there is clearly the commencement of a new subject, not a continuation of the same one. The occurrence of λειπόμενοι and λείπεται, which is regarded by some as a proof of connection between the two verses, denotes nothing in view of the fact that the subject-matter is so different; moreover, there is a distinct difference in the sense in which this word is used in these two verses; coming behindhand in what one ought to attain to is quite different from not being in possession of the great gift of wisdom; this difference is well brought out by the Vulgate rendering: ". . . in nullo *deficientes*. Si quis autem vestrum *indiget* sapientia . . ."—εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν λείπεται σοφίας: *Cf.* iii. 13-17; the position assigned to Wisdom by the Jews, and especially by Hellenistic Jews, was so exalted that a short consideration of the subject seems called for, the more so by reason of the prominence it assumes in this Epistle. It is probable that the more advanced ideas of Wisdom came originally from Babylon; for, according to the Babylonian cosmology, Wisdom existed in primeval ages before the creation of the world; it dwelt with Ea, the god of Wisdom, in the depths of the sea (*cf.* Prov. viii. 22-30); Ea the creator was therefore guided by Wisdom in his creative work (see Jeremias, *Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, pp. 29, 80); in Biblical literature Wisdom became the all-discerning intelligence of God in His work of Creation; as it was needed by God Himself, how much more by men! Hence the constant insistence on its need which is so characteristic of the book of Proverbs. This laid the foundation for the extensive *Ḥokmah* (or Wisdom) literature of the Hellenistic Jews, which exercised also a great influence upon the Jews of later times. Under the influence of Greek philosophy Wisdom became not only a divine agency, but also assumed a personal character (Wisd. vii. 22-30). According to the Jerusalem Targum to Gen. i. 1 Wisdom was the principle whereby God created the world. Generally speaking, in the later Jewish literature Wisdom refers to worldly knowledge as distinct from religious knowledge which is all comprised under the term *Torah* ("Law"); and therefore Wisdom, unlike the *Torah*, was not regarded as the exclusive possession of the Jews, though these had it in more abundant measure, *e.g.*, it is said in *Kiddushin*, 49 *b*: "Ten measures of wisdom came down from heaven, and nine of them fell to the lot of the Holy Land". On the other hand, Wisdom and the *Torah* are often identified.—αἰτείτω: for the prayer for Wisdom, *cf.* Prov. ii. 3 *f.*; Wisd. vii. 7, ix. 4; Sir. i. 10, li. 13; in the Epistle of Barnabas xxi. 5, it says: ὁ Θεὸς δῴη ὑμῖν σοφίαν . . . ὑπομονὴν—παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς: there is an in

αὐτῷ. 6. [s]αἰτείτω δὲ ἐν πίστει, μηδὲν [t]διακρινόμενος· ὁ γὰρ διακρινόμενος ἔοικεν [u]κλύδωνι[2] θαλάσσης[3] ἀνεμιζομένῳ καὶ ῥιπιζομένῳ[3]. 7. μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ὅτι λήμψεταί[4] τι[5]

s Mark xi. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 8; *cf.* Heb. x. 22.
t *Cf.* ii. 4; Matt. xxi. 21.
u Luke viii. 24; Eph. iv. 14; *cf.* Matt. xi. 7; Isa. lvii. 20.

[1] Autem, *ff*, Vulg^{F}.
[2] Add et *s*.
[3—3] Transp., Pesh.
[4] ληψεται KLP, curss.
[5] Om. א^{a}, 36, *s*.

teresting parallel to this thought in the opening treatise of the Talmud, *Berachoth*, 58 *b*: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, Who hast imparted of Thy wisdom to flesh and blood"; the point of the words "flesh and blood" is that the reference is to Gentiles as well as Jews, corresponding thus to the **πᾶσιν** in the words before us. The force of **ἁπλῶς** lies in its sense of "singleness of aim," the aim being the imparting of benefit without requiring anything in return; the thought is the same as that which underlies Isa. lv. 1, *Ho, every one that thirsteth . . . come, buy wine and milk without money and without price, i.e.*, it is to be had for the asking.—**μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος**: the addition of this is very striking; it is intended to encourage boldness in making petition to God; many might be deterred, owing to a sense of unworthiness, from approaching God, fearing lest He should resent presumption. The three words which express the method of Divine giving—**πᾶσιν, ἁπλῶς, μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος**—must take away all scruple and fear; *cf.* Heb. iv. 16, *Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace. . . .*—**καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ**: *Cf.* Matt. vii. 7.

Ver. 6. **ἐν πίστει**: **πίστις**, as used in this Epistle, refers to the state of mind in which a man not only believes in the existence of God, but in which His ethical character is apprehended and the evidence of His good-will towards man is acknowledged; it is a belief in the beneficent activity, as well as in the personality, of God; it includes reliance on God and the expectation that what is asked for will be granted by Him. The word here does not connote faith in the sense of a body of doctrine. This idea of faith is not specifically Christian; it was, and is, precisely that of the Jews; with these אמונה (*Emûnah*) is just that perfect trust in God which is expressed in what is called the "Creed of Maimonides," or the "Thirteen principles of faith"; it is there said: "I believe with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be be His name, is the Author and Guide of everything that has been created, and that He alone has made, does make, and will make all things". In Talmudical literature, which, in this as in so much else, embodies much ancient material, the Rabbis constantly insist on the need of faith as being that which is "perfect trust in God"; the *mĕchûsarê 'amanah, i.e.*, "those who are lacking in faith," (*cf.* Matt. vi. 30, **ὀλιγόπιστοι** = קטני אמונה) are held up to rebuke; it is said in *Sotah*, ix. 12 that the disappearance of "men of faith" will bring about the downfall of the world. Faith therefore, in the sense in which it is used in this Epistle, was the characteristic mark of the Jew as well as of the Christian. In reference to **αἰτείτω δὲ ἐν πίστει** Knowling draws attention to Hermas, *Mand.*, ix. 6, 7; Sim., v. 4, 3.—**μηδὲν διακρινόμενος**: **διακρίνεσθαι** means to be in a critical state of mind, which is obviously the antithesis to that of him who has faith; it excludes faith *ipso facto*; *Cf.* Matt. xxi. 21, *If ye have faith and doubt not* (**μὴ διακριθῆτε**) . . .; Aphrates quotes as a saying of our Lord's: "Doubt not, that ye sink not into the world, as Simon, when he doubted, began to sink into the sea".—**ἔοικεν κλύδωνι θαλάσσης**: a very vivid picture; the instability of a billow, changing from moment to moment, is a wonderfully apt symbol of a mind that cannot fix itself in belief. **ἔοικεν** occurs only here and in ver. 23 in the N.T., **κλύδων** only elsewhere in Luke viii. 24.—**ἀνεμιζομένῳ**: a number of verbs are used in this Epistle ending in **-ιζω**, *viz.*, **ὀνειδίζω, ῥιπίζω, παραλογίζομαι, φλογίζω, ἐγγίζω, καθαρίζω, ἁγνίζω, ἀφανίζω, θησαυρίζω, θερίζω, στηρίζω, μακαρίζω**; the word before us is one of the sixteen used in the Epistle which do not occur elsewhere in the N.T., nor in the Septuagint.—**ῥιπιζομένῳ**: from **ῥιπίς** a "fan"; it occurs here only in the N.T., but *cf.* Dan. ii. 35 (Septuagint), **καὶ ἐρρίπισεν αὐτὰ ὁ ἄνεμος**; the word is not used in Theodotion's version. With the verse before us *cf.* Eph. iv. 14. . . . **κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας.**

Ver. 7. **μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω**, etc.: **γὰρ**

v *Cf.* iv. 8; παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου,[1] 8. ἀνὴρ[2] [v]δίψυχος, [w]ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις Sir. i. 28, v. 9, 10.; ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ. 9. [x]Καυχάσθω δὲ ὁ[3] ἀδελφὸς ὁ ταπεινὸς ἐν τῷ *cf.* 1 Kgs. xviii. 21; Ps. cxix. 113 (Heb.); Sir. ii. 12; Matt. vi. 24. w 2 Pet. ii. 14; *cf.* iii. 16. x *Cf.* ii. 13, iii. 14, iv. 6.

[1] With comma, Ti., Weiss; with stop, Treg.; without punctuation, WH.
[2] Add γαρ 33. [3] Om. B, 65, Arm, WH in brackets.

almost in the sense of **διὰ τοῦτο**. The verb occurs very rarely, see John xxi. 25; Phil. i. 17. There is a ring of contempt in the passage at the idea of a man with halting faith expecting his prayer to be answered. **ἄνθρωπος** is used here in reference to men in general; **ἀνήρ** in the next verse is more specific; in this Epistle **ἀνήρ** occurs usually with some qualifying word.—**τοῦ Κυρίου**: obviously in reference to God the Father on account of the **τοῦ διδ. Θεοῦ** above.

Ver. 8. **δίψυχος**: Although this word is not found in either the Septuagint or elsewhere in the N.T. (excepting in iv. 8) its occurrence is not rare otherwise; Clement of Rome, quoting what he calls **ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος**, says: **ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ . . .** (Resch., *Agrapha*, p. 325 [2nd ed.]); the word occurs a number of times in Hermas, *e.g.*, *Mand.*, ix. 1, 5, 6, 7; xi. 13; so too in Barn., xix. 5, and in Did., iv. 4, as well as in other ancient Christian writings and in Philo. The frame of mind of the **ἀνὴρ δίψυχος** is equivalent to a "double heart," see Sir. i. 25, **μὴ προσέλθῃς αὐτῷ** (*i.e.*, the fear of the Lord) **ἐν καρδίᾳ δισσῇ**; this is precisely the equivalent of the Hebrew לֵב וָלֵב in Ps. xii. 3, which the Septuagint unfortunately translates literally, **ἐν καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐν καρδίᾳ**. In Enoch xci. 4 we have: "Draw not nigh to uprightness with a double heart, and associate not with those of a double heart"; as the Greek version of this work is not extant it is impossible to say for certain how "double heart" was rendered. On the construction here see Mayor.—**ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ**: this is severe, and reads as if the writer had some particular person in mind. The double-hearted man is certainly one who is quite unreliable. **Ἀκατάστατος**, which occurs only here and in iii. 8 (but see critical note) in the N.T., is found in the Septuagint, though very rarely; in Isa. liv. 11 we have **Ταπεινὴ καὶ ἀκατάστατος οὐ παρεκλήθης**, where the Hebrew for **ἀκατάστ.** (סֹעֲרָה) means "storm-tossed". In the verse before us the word seems to mean unreliability, the man who does not trust God cannot be trusted by men; this probably is what must have been in the mind of the writer. —**ἐν πάσαις**, etc.: a Hebrew expression for the course of a man's life in the sense of his "manner of life" (**ἀναστροφή**, see iii. 13) see Prov. iii. 1, **ἐν πάσαις ὁδοῖς σου γνώριζε αὐτήν** (Hebrew **αὐτόν**), **ἵνα ὀρθοτομῇ τὰς ὁδούς σου.** The sense of the expression is certainly different from **ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ** in ver. 11 which refers to the days of a man's life.

Vv. 9-11. An entirely new subject is now started, which has no connection with what has preceded; such a connection can only be maintained by supplying mental links artificially, for which the text gives no warrant. Vv. 9-11 deal with the subject of rich and poor; they may be interpreted in two ways; on the one hand, one may paraphrase thus: Let the brother who is "humble," *i.e.*, belonging to the lower classes and therefore of necessity (in those days) poor, glory in the exaltation which as a Christian he partakes of; but let him who was rich glory in the fact that, owing to his having embraced Christianity, he is humiliated (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 10-13), "let the rich brother glory in his humiliation as a Christian" (Mayor)—taking **ταπείνωσις**, however, as having the sense of self-abasement which the rich man feels on becoming a Christian. This interpretation has its difficulties, for it is the rich man, not merely his riches, who "passes away"; so, too, in ver. 11; moreover, if it is a question of Christianity, **ὕψει** and **ταπεινώσει** cannot well *both* refer to it, since they are placed in contrast; this seems to have been felt by an ancient scribe who altered **ταπεινώσει** to **πίστει** in the cursive 137 (see critical note above), thinking, no doubt, of ii. 5, **οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ πλουσίους ἐν πίστει . . .** It seems wiser to take the words as they stand, and to

ὕψει αὐτοῦ, 10. ὁ δὲ [x]πλούσιος ἐν τῇ [a]ταπεινώσει[1] αὐτοῦ, ὅτι [y]ὡς [b]ἄνθος χόρτου[b] [c]παρελεύσεται. 11. ἀνέτειλεν γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος [z]σὺν τῷ καύσωνι καὶ ἐξήρανεν τὸν χόρτον, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξέπεσεν καὶ ἡ εὐπρέπεια τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἀπώλετο· οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ μαρανθήσεται.

x Matt. xxiii. 12. y Jer. ix. 23. a *Cf.* Heb. x. 34. z Jas. i. 11. b—b Isa. xl. 6, 7; 1 Pet. i. 24; *cf.* Ps. cii. 4, 11; Job xiv. 2. c *Cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 31.

[1] πιστει 137.

seek to interpret them without reading in something that is not there, especially as the writer (or writers) of this Epistle is not as a rule ambiguous in what he says; in fact, one of the characteristics of the Epistle is the straightforward, transparent way in which things are put. Regarded from this point of view, these verses simply contain a wholesome piece of advice to men to do their duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call them; if the poor man becomes wealthy, there is nothing to be ashamed of, he is to be congratulated; if the rich man loses his wealth, he needs comfort,—after all, there is something to be thankful for in escaping the temptations and dangers to which the rich are subject; and, as the writer points out later on in ii. 1 ff., the rich *are* oppressors and cruel,—a fact which (it is well worth remembering) was far more true in those days than in these.

Ver. 9. **καυχάσθω**: it is noticeable that this word is only used in the Pauline Epistles, with the exception in this verse and in iii. 14, iv. 16; it is used, generally, in a good sense, as here and iii 14, though not in iv. 16.—**ὁ ἀδελφός**: see note on ver. 2.—**ταπεινός**: *cf.* Luke i. 52, refers to the outward condition of a man, and corresponds to the Hebrew דַּל and עָנִי, which like **ταπεινός**, can refer both to outward condition and character; the latter is the meaning attaching to **ταπ.** in iv. 6. In Sir. xi. 1 we read: **σοφία ταπεινοῦ ἀνύψωσεν κεφαλήν, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ μεγιστάνων καθίσει αὐτόν.** *Cf.* Sir. x. 31 (Hebrew).

Ver. 10. **ὁ πλούσιος**: equally a "brother"; *cf.* the whole section ii. 1-13 below.—**ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου . . .**: these words, together with **ἐξήρανεν τὸν χόρτον**, etc., in the next verse, are adapted from the Sept. of Isa. xl. 5-8, **. . . καὶ εἶπα τί βοήσω; Πᾶσα σὰρξ χόρτος, καὶ πᾶσα δόξα ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου· ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ ὁ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν, τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,** which differs somewhat from the Hebrew. It is an interesting instance of the loose way in which scriptural texts were made use of without regard to their original meaning; the prophet refers to **πᾶσα σάρξ**, whereas in the verse before us the writer makes the words refer exclusively to the rich, *cf.* the words at the end of the next verse, **οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ μαρανθήσεται.** To the precise Western mind this rather free use of Scripture (many examples of it occur in the Gospels) is sometimes apt to cause surprise; but it is well to remember that this inexactness is characteristic of the oriental, and does not strike him as inexact; what he wants in these cases is a verbal point of attachment which will illustrate the subject under discussion; what the words originally refer to is, to him, immaterial, as that does not come into consideration. **χόρτος** in its original sense means "an enclosure" in which cattle feed, then it came to mean the grass, etc., contained in the enclosure, *cf.* Matt. vi. 31.—**παρελεύσεται**: equally true of rich and poor, *cf.* Mark xiii. 31 for the transient character of all things, see also iv. 14 of this Epistle.

Ver. 11. **ἀνέτειλεν**: the "gnomic" aorist, *i.e.*, expressive of what always happens; it gives a "more vivid statement of general truths, by employing a distinct case or several distinct cases in the past to represent (as it were) all possible cases, and implying that what has occurred is likely to occur again under similar circumstances" (Moulton, p. 135, quoting Goodwin); he adds, "the gnomic aorist . . . need not have been denied by Winer for Jas. i. 11 and 1 Pet. i, 24". The R.V. gives the present, in accordance with the English idiom, but clearly the Greek way is the more exact; the same applies to Hebrew, though this particular verb does not occur in the corresponding passage in either the Septuagint or the Massoretic text; an example may, however, be seen in Nah. iii. 17. **ὁ ἥλιος ἀνέτειλεν, καὶ ἀφήλατο, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς** (see R.V.).—**σὺν τῷ καύσωνι**: the east wind which came from the Syrian desert, it was a hot wind which parched the vegetation and blighted the foliage of the trees; the Hebrew name רוּחַ הַקָּדִים "the wind of the east," or simply קָדִים, expresses the quarter whence it comes,

d Matt. xx. 12; Luke xii. 55.
e Quoted from Isa. xl. 7
f—f Quoted from Dan. xii. 12.
g *Cf.* v. 11.; 1 Pet. iii. 14; Prov. iii. 11.

σὺν τῷ [d] καύσωνι [1] καὶ ἐξήρανεν τὸν χόρτον, [2]καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ,[3] [e]ἐξέπεσεν[2] καὶ ἡ εὐπρέπεια τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ [4] ἀπώλετο· [2]οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις [5] αὐτοῦ [6] μαρανθήσεται.[2] 12. [f g]Μακάριος ἀνὴρ [7] ὃς ὑπομένει [f 8] πειρασμόν, ὅτι

[1] Add Suo *ff*.
[2—2] Syrlec om. και το ανθος αυτου εξεπεσεν, and ουτως και . . . μαρανθησεται.
[3] Om. 69. [4] Om. B. [5] ποριαις אA, 40, 89, 97, Thl.; in actu *ff*.
[6] εαυτου C[1](vid). [7] ανθρωπος A, 70[a], 104.
[8] υπομενη 13, *m*, υπομεινη 13[a], sustinuerit, *ff*.

the Greek **καύσων**, "burner," describes its character, see Hos. xiii. 15; Ezek. xvii. 10; it became especially dangerous when it developed into a storm, on account of its great violence, see Isa. xxvii. 8; Jer. xviii. 17; Ezek. xxvii. 26.—**ἐξέπεσεν**: the equivalent Hebrew word is נָבַל, which like the cognate root in other Semitic languages, contains the idea of dying, *cf.* Isa. xxiv. 4, xxvi. 19.—**εὐπρέπεια τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ**: pleonastic; **προσ.** is used mostly in reference to persons, *e.g.*, in Sir. it occurs twenty-eight times, and only in two instances to things other than persons, *viz.*, xxxviii. 8, **καὶ εἰρήνη παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς** [Hebrew marg., however reads מפני אדם], xl. 6 . . . **ἀπὸ προσώπου πολέμου** [Hebrew text, however, מפני רודף]. **εὐπρέπεια** does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.; see Sir. xlvii. 10, its only occurrence in that book.—**ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ**: see above ver. 8. —**μαρανθήσεται**: only here in N.T.

Vv. 12 ff. The section vv. 12-16 is wholly unconnected with what immediately precedes; it takes up the thread which was interrupted at i. 4. In i. 2-4 the brethren are bidden to rejoice when they fall into temptations because the purifying of their faith which this results in engenders **ὑπομονήν**, and if **ὑπομονή** holds sway unimpeded they will be lacking in nothing. But it is, of course, a prime condition here that those who are tempted should not succumb; the rejoicing is obviously only in place in so far as temptation, by being resisted, strengthens character; therefore the writer goes on to speak (ver. 12) of the blessedness of the man who fulfils this first condition, who endures (**ὃς ὑπομένει**) temptation, for he shall receive the crown of life, the reward of those in whom **ὑπομονή** has had its perfect work. It is this intimate connection between i. 2-4 and i. 12 ff. which induces one to hazard the conjecture that they were not originally separated by the intervening verses, which deal with entirely different subjects, and which therefore interrupt the thought-connection clearly existing between the two passages just mentioned.—In ver. 13 the occurrence of the words: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God," show that this view was actually held, indeed the belief was very widely prevalent and had been for long previously, *e.g.*, in Sir. xv. 11 ff. it is said: "Say not thou, It is through the Lord that I fell away; for thou shalt not do the things that he hateth. Say not thou, It is he that caused me to err; for he hath no need of a sinful man. . . . He himself made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel . . ."; to say, with some commentators, that there is no reference here to any definite philosophical teaching, and that the words only express a natural human tendency to shift the blame for evil-doing in a man from himself to God, is an extraordinary position to take up; the tendency to shift blame is certainly natural and human, but it is not natural to shift it on to *God*; either on to fellow-men, or on to Satan, but not on to God! But besides this, nobody conversant with the teaching of Judaism during the centuries immediately preceding the commencement of the Christian era, and onwards, could for a moment fail to see what the writer of the Epistle is referring to; a writer who in a number of respects shows himself so thoroughly *au fait* with the thought-tendencies of his time (i. 5, iii. 13-18, ii. 14-26, ver. 19-20 besides the passage before us) was not likely to have been ignorant of the fact that among all the thoughtful men of his day the great question of the origin of evil was being

δόκιμος [h] γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς [i] ζωῆς, ὃν [k] ἐπηγγείλατο [1] τοῖς [1] ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

h Rom. xvi. 10.
i Rev. ii. 10; *cf.* Wisd. iv. 2, v. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 25.
k See ii. 5; *cf.*; Matt. x. 22, xix. 28, 29.

13. [m] Μηδεὶς πειραζόμενος λεγέτω ὅτι ἀπὸ [2] Θεοῦ πειράζομαι [3]· ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστιν κακῶν, πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα.[m]

l 1 Cor. ii. 9. m—m *Cf.* Sir. xv. 11, 12, 20.

[1] Add **ο κυριος** KLP, Syr^{hk}., Thl., Oec., etc., rec. + **κυριος** C, 4, 13(vid), 117, + **ο θεος** Syr^{lec}, Pesh., Vulg., Copt., Aeth.

[2] **υπο** א 69. [3] Tentatur *ff*, Vulg.

constantly speculated upon. The words with which this section concludes—"Be not deceived, my beloved brethren"—show that there was a danger of those to whom the Epistle was addressed being led astray by a false teaching, which was as incompatible with the true Jewish doctrine of God as it was with the Christian; indeed, on this point, Jewish and Christian teaching were identical. The subject referred to in this section, vv. 12-16, is dealt with more fully in the Introduction IV., § 1, which see.

Ver. 12. **Μακάριος ἀνήρ**: this pleonastic use of **ἀνήρ** is Hebraic; *cf.* Ps. i. 1, where the expression אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ ("O, the blessedness of the man . . .") is rendered **μακάριος ἀνήρ** by the Septuagint.—**ὑπομένει**: carries on the thought of **ὑπομονή** in ver. 4; the absence of all reference to divine grace entirely accords with the Jewish doctrine of works, and is one of the many indications in this Epistle that the writer (or writers) had as yet only imperfectly assimilated Christian doctrine, see further Introduction IV., § 2.—**πειρασμόν**: see note on i. 2.—**δόκιμος γενόμενος**: for **δοκ.** see note on i. 2; *cf.* Luther's rendering: "nachdem er bewähret ist," which contains the idea of something being preserved, *i.e.*, the *genuine* part, after the dross (as it were) has been purged away.—**τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς**: Wisdom and the Law (*Torah*) are said to be an ornament of grace to the head (Prov. i. 9), and Wisdom "shall deliver unto thee a crown of glory" (Prov. iv. 9); in *Pirqe Aboth* vi. 7 this is said of the *Torah*, of which it is also said in the same section, "She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her" (Prov. iii. 18); in Sir. xv. 6 it is said that a wise man shall "inherit joy, and a crown of gladness (there is no mention of a crown in the Hebrew), and an everlasting name," *cf.* xxxii. (xxxv.) 2. In the *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Lev. iv. 1, we read: "Be followers of his compassion, therefore, with a good mind, that ye also may wear crowns of glory"; *cf. Asc. of Isaiah*, vii. 22, viii. 26, ix. 10-13. The Hebrew עַטָרָה is used both in a literal and figurative sense (for the latter see, *e.g.*, Job xix. 9) it is probably in a figurative sense that the word is here used.—**ὃν ἐπηγγ. τοῖς ἀγαπ. αὐτόν**: the insertion of **ὁ Θεός** or **ὁ Κύριος** is found only in authorities of secondary value. The words **λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς ὃν . . .**, introduced by **ὅτι** (*cf.* in next verse **ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ . . .** refer perhaps to a saying of our Lord's which has not been preserved elsewhere; the *thought* seems to be present in such passages as 2 Tim. ii. 5, iv. 8; 1 Pet. v. 4; Rev. ii. 10, iii. 11, iv. 4, vi. 2; *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 25, which makes it all the more probable that the words were based ultimately on some actual "Logion" of Christ (*cf.* Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30; *cf.* too, the following words which occur in the *Acta Philippi*: **. . . μακάριός ἐστιν ὁ ἔχων τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔνδυμα λαμπρόν· αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ λαμβάνων τὸν στέφανον τῆς χαρᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ**, see Resch, *Agrapha*(2), p. 280). Against this it might be urged that mention would probably have been made of the fact if the words were actually those of our Lord, in the same way in which this is done in Acts xx. 35, where St. Paul directly specifies his authority in quoting a saying of Christ. There is an interesting passage in the *History of Barlaam and Josaphat*, quoted by James in "The Revelation of Peter," p. 59, which runs: "And as he was entering into the gate, others met him, all radiant with light, having crowns in their hands which shone with unspeakable beauty, and such as mortal eyes never beheld; and when Josaphat asked: 'Whose are the exceeding bright crowns of glory which I see?' 'One,' they said, 'is thine'".

Ver. 13. **Μηδεὶς πειραζόμενος λεγέτω**: In view of the specific doc-

n Matt. v. 28.
o 2 Pet. ii. 14, 18.
p—p *Cf.* Ps. vii. 14.
q *Cf.* Rom. v. 12.

14. ἕκαστος δὲ πειράζεται[1] ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας [n] ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελκόμενος καὶ [o] δελεαζόμενος· 15. [p]εἶτα ἡ[2] ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, [p] ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία [p] ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει[3] [q] θάνατον.

[1] Om. *s*. [2] Om. C. [3] ἀποκυεῖ WH.

trine which is being combated in these verses, it is probable that the verb **πειράζω** is here used in the restricted sense of temptation to lust, and not in the more general sense (**πειρασμοῖς ποικίλοις**) in which **πειρασμός** is used in i. 2. This view obtains support from the repeated mention of **ἐπιθυμία** in vv. 14, 15. The tendency to a sin which was so closely connected with the nature, the lower nature, of man (*cf.* Rom. vii. 23) would, on this very account, be regarded by many as in the last instance referable to the Creator of man; that this belief was held will be seen from the authorities cited in the Introduction IV., § 1. On this view **πειραζόμενος** refers to temptation of a special kind, **ἐπιθυμία**; *cf.* Matt. v. 28, **πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι . . .**; 1 Pet. ii. 11, **Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ . . . ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς**; iv. 2-3 **. . . εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ. . . .**—**ὅτι**: *Cf.* the parallel use of כִּי in Hebrew.—**ἀπείραστός ἐστι κακῶν**: "Untemptable of evil"; see Mayor's very interesting note on **ἀπείραστος**; the word does not occur elsewhere in N.T., nor in the Septuagint. If the interpretation of this passage given above be correct, the meaning here would seem to be that it is inconceivable that the idea should come into the mind of God to tempt men to lust; the "untemptableness" has perhaps a two-fold application: God cannot be tempted to do evil Himself, nor can He be tempted with the wish to tempt men. The word in its essence is really an insistence upon one of the fundamental beliefs concerning the Jewish doctrine of God, *viz.*, His attribute of Holiness and ethical purity; the teaching of many centuries is summed up in the third of the "Thirteen Principles" of Maimonides: "I believe with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be His name, is not a body, and that He is free from all the accidents of matter, and that He has not any form whatsoever". The Peshittâ rendering of this clause, from which one might have looked for something suggestive, is very disappointing and entirely loses the force of the Greek.—**πειράζει**, etc., see Introduction IV., § 1.

Ver. 14. **ἕκαστος δὲ πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας**: according to this the evil originates in man himself, which would be the case more especially with the sin of lust; with regard to temptation to sin of another character see 1 Thess. iii. 5, **. . . μή πως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων**, who is doubtlessly to be identified with Satan. —**ἐξελκόμενος καὶ δελεαζόμενος**: describes the method of the working of **ἐπιθυμία**, the first effect of which is "to draw the man out of his original repose, the second to allure him to a definite bait" (Mayor). **ἐξελκ.** is in its original meaning used of fishing, **δελεαζ.** of hunting, and then of the wiles of the harlot; both the participles might be transferred, from their literal use in application to hunting or fishing, to a metaphorical use of alluring to sensual sin, and thus desire entices the man from his self-restraint as with the wiles of a harlot, a metaphor maintained by the words which follow, 'conceived,' 'beareth,' 'bringeth forth'; *cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 14, 18, where the same verb is found, and Philo, *Quod omn. prob lib.*, 22, 'driven by passion or *enticed* by pleasure'" (Knowling).

Ver. 15. **εἶτα**: continuing the description of the method of the working of **ἐπιθυμία**.—**ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν**: With this idea of personification, *cf.* Zech. v. 5-11, where the woman "sitting in the midst of the ephah" is the personification of Wickedness; and for the metaphor see Ps. vii. 15 (Sept.), **ἰδοὺ ὠδίνησεν ἀνομίαν, συνέλαβεν πόνον καὶ ἔτεκεν ἀδικίαν.** Since **ἐπιθυμία** is represented as the parent of **ἁμαρτία** it can hardly be regarded as other than sinful itself; indeed, this seems to be taught in the Targum of Jonathan (a Targum which had received general recognition in Babylonia as early as the third century A.D., and whose elements therefore go back to a much earlier time) in the paraphrase of Isa. lxii. 10,

16. Μὴ[1] [r]πλανᾶσθε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί. 17. [s]Πᾶσα [t]δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα [u]τέλειον [v]ἄνωθέν ἐστιν[2] καταβαῖνον[3] ἀπὸ[4]

r 1 Cor. vi. 9; *cf.* Eph. v. 6. s Ps. lxxxv. 12; Tobit iv. 19; John iii. 27; 1 Cor. iv. 7. t Matt. vii. 11; Phil. iv. 15. u Eccles. iii. 14. v *Cf.* iii. 15, 17; John iii. 3.

[1] μηδε 13. [2] Om. *ff*, εστιν, WH.
[3] καταβαινων A, 13; κατερχομενον 27[2]. [4] παρα K, curss.

where it says that the *imagination* of sin is sinful, *cf.* Jer. Targ. i. to Deut. xxiii. 11; this is evidently the idea in the words before us.—**ἀποτελεσθεῖσα**: this word does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., and only very rarely in the Septuagint, *cf.* 1 Esdras, v. 7, **ἀπεκώλυσαν τοῦ ἀποτελεσθῆναι** (A reads **ἐπιτελεσθ.**) **τὴν οἰκοδομήν**; 2 Macc. xv. 39. . . . **οἶνος ὕδατι συνκερασθεὶς ἤδη καὶ ἐπιτερπῆ τὴν χάριν ἀποτελεῖ** . . .; it refers here to sin in its full completeness, Vulg., *cum consummatum fuerit*. The passage recalls Rom. vi. 28, **τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος**. Mayor quotes the appropriate passage from Hermas, *Mand.*, iv. 2. **ἡ ἐνθύμησις αὕτη Θεοῦ δούλῳ ἁμαρτία μεγάλη· ἐὰν δέ τις ἐργάσηται τὸ ἔργον τὸ πονηρὸν τοῦτο, θάνατον ἑαυτῷ κατεργάζεται.** Just as **ἐπιθυμία** and **θάνατος** belong together, and the latter testifies to the existence of the former, so **πίστις** and **ἔργα** belong together, and the latter proves the existence of the former; see ii. 22, **ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη.**—**ἀποκύει**: only here and in ver. 18 in the N.T., it only occurs once in the Septuagint, 4 Macc. xv. 17, **ὦ μόνη γύναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν ὁλόκληρον ἀποκυήσασα.**—**θάνατον**: in *Tanchuma, Bereshith*, 8, it is taught that Adam's sin was the means of death entering into the world, so that all generations to the end of time are subject to death; this teaching is, of course, found in both early and late Jewish literature; but it probably is not this to which reference is made in the passage before us. In seeking to realise what the writer meant by death here one recalls, in the first place, such passages as Rom. v. 21: *As sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord; cf.* vi. 21, vii. 24; John v. 24: *He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgement, but hath passed out of death into life; cf.* viii. 51, 52; 1 John iii. 14: *We know that we have passed from death unto life*: see also Rom. vii. 24; 2 Cor. i. 9, 10; 2 Tim. i. 10; and Jas. v. 20, . . . *shall save a soul from death* . . .; it seems clear that in passages like these death is not used in its literal sense, and probably what underlies the use of the word is that which is more explicitly expressed in Rev. ii. 11, *He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death;* xx. 6 . . . *Over these the second death hath no power;* xxi. 8, *But for the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and fornicators . . . their part shall be in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death.* But there is another set of passages in which death is used in its literal sense; these should be noted, for it is possible that they may throw light on the use of **θάνατος** in the verse before us:—Matt. xvi. 28, *Verily I say unto you, there be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom*, almost the identical words occur in Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27; the belief in the near advent of Christ witnessed to by such passages as 1 Cor. xi. 26; 2 Thess. ii. 1, etc., shows that the possibility of not dying, in the literal sense of the word, was entertained; for those who were living would know that when Christ, who had overcome death, should be among them again, there could be no question of death. The belief in the abolition of death when the Messiah should come was held by Jews as well as by Christians, see *e.g.*, *Bereshith Rabba*, chap. 26, *Wajjikra Rabba*, chap. 30. The possibility may therefore be entertained that the writer of this Epistle is contemplating death in its literal sense, which those Christians will not escape in whom **ἐπιθυμία** holds sway, but which they are able to escape if they remain faithful until the return of Christ; that this is expected in the near future is clear from v. 7, *Be patient, therefore, brethren, until the coming of the Lord . . . stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord is at hand.*—**μὴ πλανᾶσθε**: *i.e.*, as regards the false teaching concerning the cause of sin in their hearts. The affectionate ending, "My beloved brethren" witnesses to the earnestness of the writer's feelings.

Ver. 17. The following saying of R. Chaninah (first century, A.D.) is preserved:

w Job xxv. 3; *cf.* 1 John i. 5. x Mal. iii. 6; *cf.* Num. xiii. 19. y Wisd. vii. 18. z John iii. 3; *cf.* Phil. ii. 13. a—a John i. 13; 1 Pet. i. 23. b *Cf.* Eph. i. 12. c Jer. ii. 3; Rev. xiv. 4; Rom. viii. 19-23.

w τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν [w] φώτων, παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἔνι[1] [x] παραλλαγὴ ἢ τροπῆς[2] [y] ἀποσκίασμα.[3] 18. [z] βουληθεὶς[4] [a] ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας,[a] εἰς τὸ εἶναι [b] ἡμᾶς [c] ἀπαρχήν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ[5] κτισμάτων.

[1] εστιν א P, 36. [2] Modicum obumbrationis *ff*. [3] αποσκιασματος א B. [4] Add enim, Vulg., pr. αυτος γαρ 40. [5] εαυτου א[3]ACP, 105; WH altern. reading.

א"ר חנינא אין דבר רע יורד מלמעלה: ("R. Chaninah said, 'No evil thing cometh down from above'".). On the possible connection between this verse and the preceding section, see Introduction IV., § 1.—**πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον**: Mayor remarks on this: "It will be observed that the words make a hexameter line, with a short syllable lengthened by the metrical stress. I think Ewald is right in considering it to be a quotation from some Hellenistic poem. . . . The authority of a familiar line would add persuasion to the writer's words, and account for the somewhat subtle distinction between **δοσ. ἀγ.** and **δω. τελ.**". In Theodotion's version of Daniel ii. 6, occur the words: **. . . δόματα καὶ δωρεὰς . . .**, which represent מתנן and נבזבה in the corresponding Aramaic (the Septuagint has another reading); the distinction between these two is perhaps that the former refers to gifts in the ordinary sense, while the latter is a gift given in return for something done, *i.e.*, a reward; but it cannot be said that the Greek reflects this distinction, though it is worthy of note that Philo makes a special distinction between them, "inasmuch as the latter noun is much stronger than the former, and contains the idea of greatness and perfection which is lacking in the former; Philo, *De Cherub.*, 25; and so *De Leg. Alleg.*, iii. 70, where he applies to the latter noun the same epithet 'perfect' as in the Greek of the verse before us" (Knowling).—**ἄνωθέν ἐστιν**: it is a question whether one should read: "Every good gift . . . from above comes down from . . .," so the Peshittâ; or "Every good gift . . . is from above, coming down from . . ."; Mayor thinks that on the whole "the rhythm and balance of the sentence is better preserved by separating **ἐστι** from **καταβαῖνον**".—**ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων**: *Cf.* on the one hand, Sir. xliii. 9, **Κάλλος οὐρανοῦ, δόξα ἄστρων, κόσμος φωτίζων, ἐν ὑψίστοις Κύριος**; and, on the other 1 John i. 5, **ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστιν καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστιν οὐδεμία.** There can be no doubt that in the passage before us this double meaning of light, literal and spiritual, is meant.—**παραλλαγή**: only here in the N.T., and in 4 Kings ix, 20 (Septuagint); it is rendered שוחלפא in the Peshittâ, a word which is used variously of "change," "caprice," and even "apostasy" (see Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.*, s.v.). In Greek, according to Mayor, the word may be taken "to express the contrast between the natural sun, which varies its position in the sky from hour to hour and month to month, and the eternal source of all light".—**τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα**: neither of these words is found elsewhere in the N.T., and the latter does not occur in the Septuagint either; the former is used in the Septuagint of the movements of the heavenly bodies, Deut. xxxiii. 14: **καὶ καθ' ὥραν γενημάτων ἡλίου τροπῶν . . .**; *cf.* Job xxxviii. 33. The meaning of the latter part of the verse befor us is well brought out by Luther: "Bei welchem ist keine Veränderung noch Wechsel des Lichts und Finsterniss". If, as hinted above, there is a connection between this verse and the section i. 5-8, the meaning may perhaps be expressed thus: When, in answer to prayer, God promises the gift of wisdom, it is certain to be given, for He does not change; *cf.* for the thought, Rom. xi. 29, **ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλῆσις τοῦ Θεοῦ.**

Ver. 18. Again we have a verse without any connection between what precedes or follows; the words **ἴστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί** of ver. 19 seem to belong to ver. 18. As we have seen, ver. 17 most probably contains a quotation; the possibility of ver. 18 being also a loose quotation, from some other author, should not be lost sight of; it would ex-

19. [1]Ἴστε,[2] ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί.[1] Ἔστω δὲ[3] πᾶς ἄνθρωπος [d]ταχὺς εἰς τὸ [d]ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ [e]λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς [f]ὀργήν· 20. [g]ὀργὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην Θεοῦ οὐκ ἐργάζεται.[g][4] 21. διὸ[5] [h]ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν [i]ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσείαν[6] [k]κακίας ἐν[7]

d Sir. v. 11; Eccles. v. 1. e *Cf.* iii. 2; Prov. x. 19, xvii. 27; Eccles. v. 2; Sir. i. 29, iv. 29, v. 13. f Prov. xiv. 29; *cf.* Eccles. vii. 9; Eph. iv. 26. g—g Col. iii. 8. h Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 1; *cf.* Acts xv. 9; Heb. xii. 1. i Rev. xxii. 11. k Tit. iii. 3.

[1—1] **και νυν αδελφοι ημων** Aeth^{p}; **εστε αδελφοι ημων και** Aeth^{r}.

[2] **ωστε** KL^{a}P, Syr^{hk}, Thl., Oec., etc.; **ιστω** א^{1} rec. ואנתון Pesh.; add **δε** A.

[3] **και εστω** A, 13; om. **δε** KLP^{2}, Syr^{hk}, Pesh., Arm., Thl., Oec., etc, rec.

[4] **ου κατεργ.** C*K^{a}LP, Thl., Oec., etc., rec.; *cf.* v. 3.

[5] Pr. et *ff*. [6] **περισσευμα** A, 13, 68. [7] **εμ** א.

plain, as in the case of ver. 17, the abrupt way in which it is introduced; the **ἴστε,** taken as an indicative, might well imply that the writer is referring his readers to some well-known writing, much in the same way as St. Paul does in Acts xvii. 28, **ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν, ὡς καί τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰρήκασιν· "τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν"**. For the general thought of the verse *cf.* 1 John iii. 9.—**βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας**: this is strongly suggestive of an advanced belief in the doctrine of Grace, *cf.* John xv. 16. **οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς.** The rare word **ἀπεκύησεν** is, strictly speaking, only used of the mother. "It seems clear that the phrase has particular reference to the creation of man, **κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν.** This was the truth about man which God's will realised in the creation by an act, a **λόγος,** which was the expression at once of God's will and man's nature" (Parry). —**ἀπαρχήν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων**: **ἀπαρχή** = תרומה used in reference to the *Torah* in *Shemoth Rabba*, chap. 33; see further below; the picture would be very familiar to Jews; just as the new fruits which ripen first herald the new season, so those men who are begotten **λόγῳ ἀληθείας** proclaim a new order of things in the world of spiritual growth; they are in advance of other men, in the same way that the first-fruits are in advance of the other fruits of the season. Rendel Harris illustrates this very pointedly from actual life of the present day in the East: "When one's soul desires the vintage or the fruitage of the returning summer, chronological advantage is everything. The trees that are a fortnight to the fore are the talk and delight of the town" (*Present Day Papers*, May, 1901, "The Elements of a Progressive Church").

Vv. 19-20. Another isolated saying, strongly reminiscent of the Wisdom literature; the frequent recurrence (see below) of words of this import suggests that here again the writer is recalling to the minds of his hearers familiar sayings.

Ver. 19. **ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι**: *Cf.* Sir. v. 11, **γίνου ταχὺς ἐν ἀκροάσει σου, καὶ ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ φθέγγου ἀπόκρισιν**; see iv. 29, xx. 7. A similar precept is quoted in *Qoheleth Rabba*, v. 5 (Wünsche): "Speech for a shekel, silence for two; it it is like a precious stone"; *cf.* Taylor's ed. of *Pirqe Aboth*, p. 25.—**βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν**: *Cf.* Eccles. vii. 10 (R.V. 9), **μὴ σπεύσῃς ἐν πνεύματί σου τοῦ θυμοῦσθαι, ὅτι θυμὸς ἐν κόλπῳ ἀφρόνων ἀναπαύσεται**; see, too, Prov. xvi. 32. Margoliouth (*Expos. Times*, Dec. 1893) quotes a saying which, according to Mohammedan writers, was spoken by Christ: "Asked by some how to win Paradise, He said: 'Speak not at all'. They said: 'We cannot do this'. He said then: 'Only say what is good'." It must be remembered that the Arabs are the most foul-mouthed people on earth.

Ver. 20. **ὀργὴ γὰρ**, etc.: Man's wrath is rarely, if ever, justifiable; even "just indignation" is too often intermixed with other elements; and frequently the premisses on which it is founded are at fault. Man, unlike God, never knows all the circumstances of the case. On the subject of anger, see Matt. v. 21, 22, and *cf.* the *Expositor*, July, 1905, pp. 28 ff.

Vv. 21-25 form a self-contained section. By putting away all impurity the "implanted word" can influence the heart; but it is necessary not only to hear the word but also to act in accordance with it.

Ver. 21. **ἀποθέμενοι**: used in

l iii. 13; *cf.* Ps. xxv. 9. πραΰτητι [1] [l] δέξασθε τὸν [m] ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν [n] δυνάμενον [2] σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.[n 3] 22. γίνεσθε δὲ [o] ποιηταὶ λόγου,[4] καὶ μὴ ἀκροαταὶ

m Wisd. xii. 10.

n—n Acts xiii. 26; Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 2; Eph. i. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. ii. 3.

o Matt. vii. 26; Rom. ii. 13.

[1] Add σοφιας P, add καρδιας Thl., πραυτητι Weiss.

[2] Qui potestis *ff*. [3] ημων La.

[4] νομου C^2, 38^a, 73, 83, Aeth., Thl.

Heb. xii. 1 of putting off every weight preparatory to "running the race that is set before us"; the metaphor is taken from the divesting oneself of clothes.—ῥυπαρία: not elsewhere in the N.T. or Septuagint; the Syriac has ܛܢܦܘܠܐ which is the same word used in Ezek. xliv. 6 for the Hebrew תּוֹעֵבָה "abomination," meaning that which is abhorrent to God; usually it has reference to idolatrous practices, but it occurs a number of times in the later literature in reference to unchastity, this more especially in Proverbs. The adjective is used in Zech. iii. 4 of garments, and *cf.* Rev. xxii. 11, where the meaning is "filthy". The word before us, therefore, probably means "filthiness" in the sense of lustful impurity.—περισσείαν κακίας: not merely "excess" in the sense of the A.V. "superfluity" and the R.V. "overflowing," because κακία in the smallest measure is already excess. The phrase seems to mean simply "manifold wickedness"; this has to be got out of the way first before the "implanted word" can be received.—ἐν πραΰτητι: this must refer to the meekness which *is* the natural result of true repentance. *Cf.* Matt. iv. 17, *Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.*—τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον: ἔμφυτος occurs only here in the N.T.; in Wisd. xii. 10 we have, οὐκ ἀγνοῶν ὅτι πονηρὰ ἡ γένεσις αὐτῶν καὶ ἔμφυτος ἡ κακία αὐτῶν. Mayor holds that the expression must be understood as "the rooted word," *i.e.*, a word whose property it is to root itself like a seed in the heart, *cf.* Matt. xiii. 21, οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ; and Matt. xv. 13, πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ἐκριζωθήσεται; and *cf.* iv. Esdr. ix. 31, "Ecce enim semino in vobis legem meam, et faciet in vobis fructum et glorificabimini in eo per saeculum". The meaning "rooted word" agrees admirably with the rest of the verse, and seems to give the best sense, see further below.—τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν: *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 9., τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν. The words before us leave the impression that those to whom they were addressed could not yet be called Christians; πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσείαν κακίας, which they are enjoined to put off, implies a state far removed from even a moderate Christian ideal; and the "rooted word," which is able to save their souls, has evidently not been received yet. On the subject of the "rooted word" being able to save souls, see further under ver. 22.

Ver. 22. γίνεσθε: perhaps best expressed by the German "Werdet," though Luther does not render it so.—ποιηταὶ λόγου, καὶ, etc.: Taylor quotes an appropriate passage from the Babylonian Talmud: "On Exod. xxiv. 7 which ends (lit.), *We will do and we will hear*, it is written (*Shabbath*, 88*a*) that "when Israel put *we will do* before *we will hear*, there came sixty myriads of ministering angels, and attached to each Israelite two crowns, one corresponding to *we will do*, and the other to *we will hear;* and when they sinned there came down a hundred and twenty myriads of destroying angels and tore them off" (quoted by Mayor, p. 67). The duty of doing as well as hearing is frequently insisted upon in Jewish writings. See, further, Matt. vii. 24, etc. As to the precise meaning to be attached to λόγος opinions differ; but the mention twice made of *hearing* the word makes it fairly certain that in the first instance— whatever further meaning it connoted—reference is being made to the reading of the Scriptures in the synagogue; further, the mention, also twice made, of the *doing* of the word makes it a matter of practical certainty that the reference is to the *Torah*, the Law; the fact that Jews are being addressed only emphasises this. For the attitude of the Jews towards the *Torah* during the centuries immediately preceding Christianity and onwards, see Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 135-151; here it must suffice to say that it was regarded as the final revelation of God for all time, that it was the means of salvation, and that its practice was the

μόνον [1] [p]παραλογιζόμενοι ἑαυτούς [2]· 23. [q]ὅτι [3] εἴ τις [r]ἀκροατὴς λόγου [4] ἐστὶν καὶ οὐ [r]ποιητής,[q] οὗτος ἔοικεν ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι [5] τὸ

p Col. ii. 4. q—q *Cf.* ii. 14-20; Matt. vii. 24-27; Luke vi. 46-49. r Rom. ii. 13.

[1] μονον ακροαται אACKLP, Oec., Ti. [2] Aliter consiliantes *ff*.
[3] Om. A, 13. [4] νομου 83. [5] κατανουντες (sic) א[1].

highest expression of loyalty towards God. Jews who had from childhood been taught to regard the *Torah* in this light would have found it very difficult to discard the time-honoured veneration accorded to it, and there was no need to do so, seeing the place that Christ Himself had given to it (Matt. v. 17-18, vii. 12, xii. 5, xix. 17, xxiii. 3; Luke x. 26, xvi. 17, 29), and provided that its teaching in general was regarded as preparatory to the embracing of Christianity. The intensely practical writer of this passage realised that those to whom he was writing must be drawn gently and gradually, without unduly severing them from their earlier belief, which, after all, contained so much which was identical with the new faith. The *Torah*, which had been rooted in their hearts and which was to them, in the most literal sense, the word of God, was the point of attachment between Judaism and Christianity; it was utilised by the writer in order to bring them to Christ, the "Word" of God in a newer, higher sense. All that he says here about the **λόγος** was actually the teaching of the Jews concerning the *Torah*, the revealed word of God; and all that he says was also equally true, only in a much higher sense, of the teaching of Christ, the "Word" of God,—this latter, higher conception of the "Word of God," the מימרא, was one with which Hellenistic Jews were quite familiar;—what has been said can be illustrated thus:—

In ver. 18 it is said, "Of his own will he brought us forth by the *word* of truth"; the Jews taught that they were the children of God by virtue of the *Torah*. In ver. 21 it is said, "Wherefore putting away all filthiness . . . receive the rooted word"; according to Jewish ideas, purity and the *Torah* were inseparable, it was an ancient Jewish belief that the *Torah* was the means whereby lust was annihilated in a man. In the same verse, the expression **ἔμφυτος λόγος** can have a two-fold meaning in reference to the *Torah*; either it contains an allusion to the belief that the *Torah* was implanted, like Wisdom, in God Himself from the very beginning, hence the expression ראשית ("beginning") used of the *Torah*; or else the writer is referring to the teaching of the *Torah* which was implanted, and therefore rooted, in every Jew from the earliest years. Once more, it is said that this word is able to save souls. Among the Jews it was an axiom that the *Torah* was the means of salvation; to give but one quotation illustrative of this ancient belief, in *Wajjikra Rabba*, 29 it is written: אין אורח חיים אלא תורה ("*Torah* is the only way that leadeth to life"). And finally, as already remarked, the necessity of being doers as well as hearers of the *Torah* is a commonplace in Jewish literature. For many illustrations showing the correctness of what has been said, see Weber, *Jüdische Theologie* (2nd Ed.), pp. 14-38, Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums* (1st Ed.), pp. 87-120, the various editions of *Midrashim* translated by Wünsche in "Bibliotheca Rabbinica," and the handy collection being issued under the editorship of Fiebig, entitled "Ausgewählte Mischnatractate". It will have been noticed that all that the writer of this passage says about **λόγος** as applicable to the Law, or *Torah*, is equally applicable, only in a much higher sense, to Christ; this will be obvious and need not be proved by quotations. But it is interesting to observe that apparently precisely the same thing was done by our Lord Himself, as recorded by St. John in the fourth Gospel; He adapted Jewish teaching on the *Torah* and applied it to Himself; for details of this, see Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.*, pp. 139 ff. It will be noticed that in our Epistle the writer presently goes on to substitute **νόμος** (*Torah*) for **λόγος**, ver. 25; this is very significant; the "perfect law of liberty," and the "royal law," both refer to the *Torah* as perfected by the "King of the Jews".—**παραλογιζόμενοι ἑαυτούς**: *i.e.*, deceiving the heart, as it is expressed in ver. 26; the rebuke shows the intimate knowledge on the part of the writer of the spiritual state of those to whom he is writing.

Ver. 23. **οὗτος ἔοικεν ἀνδρὶ . . . ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ**: With the thought here

πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως[1] αὐτοῦ ἐν [s]ἐσόπτρῳ· 24. κατενόησεν γὰρ[2] ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπελήλυθεν, καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο ὁποῖος ἦν. 25. ὁ δὲ [t]παρακύψας εἰς νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς [u]ἐλευθερίας καὶ παραμείνας,[3] οὐκ[4] [v]ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς γενόμενος ἀλλὰ ποιητὴς [v]ἔργου, οὗτος [w]μακάριος[5] ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ[5] ἔσται. 26. Εἴ[6] τις [x]δοκεῖ θρησκὸς εἶναι,[7] μὴ [y]χαλιναγωγῶν[8] [z]γλῶσσαν ἑαυτοῦ[9] ἀλλὰ ἀπατῶν

s 1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 8. t 1 Pet. i. 12. u *Cf.* ii. 12; John viii. 32; Rom. viii. 2; Gal. v. 1. v—v Rom. ii. 13. w Luke xi. 28; John xiii. 17. x *Cf.* Heb. iv. 1. y iii. 2, 3. z iii. 6; Ps. xxxiv. 13 (14 in Heb.); Ps. cxli. 3.

[1] Om. της γενεσεως Pesh., et al. [2] Om. *ff*.
[3] Add εν αυτω Vulg. (om. Vulg^{F}), Pesh., Syr^{hk}, Arm.
[4] Pr. ουτος KLP, Pesh., Arm., Thl., Oec., rec.
[5—5] In operibus suis *ff*. [6] Add δε CP, Pesh., latt., Copt., Treg.
[7] Add εν υμιν KL, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.
[8] χαλινων B. [9] αυτου ℵACKL, Oec., Ti., Treg., WH (altern. reading).

contained, *cf.* Pseudo-Cyprian in *De duobus mont.*, chap. 13: "Ita me in vobis videte, quomodo quis vestrum se videt in aquam aut in speculum" (Resch., *op. cit.*, p. 35), *cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 18.—**τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ**: *Cf.* Jud. xii. 18, **πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς γενέσεως**, "all the days of the natural life," **γεν.** being used of unenduring existence; if this is the meaning here, it is used "to contrast the reflexion in the mirror of the face which belongs to this transitory life, with the reflexion, as seen in the Word, of the character which is being here moulded for eternity" (Mayor). In ver. 24, "forgetteth what manner of man he was" makes it improbable that the reference is to the "natural face," because a man would probably have some idea as to what his features were like. If **πρόσωπον** is here used in the sense of "personality" (as in Sir. iv. 22, 27, vii. 6, x. 5, xlii. 1, etc.) then the reference would perhaps be to a man looking into his conscience, *i.e.*, "the personality at its birth," before he had become sin-stained; this being what he was originally meant to be. The Peshiṭṭâ simplifies the matter by omitting **τῆς γενέσεως**, and is followed in this by some minor authorities.—**ἐσόπτρῳ**: *Cf.* Sir. xii. 11 . . . **καὶ ἔσῃ αὐτῷ ὡς ἐκμεμαχὼς ἔσοπτρον**; and Wisd. vii. 26.

Ver. 24. **κατενόησεν . . . ἀπελήλυθεν**: gnomic aorists, see note on **ἀνέτειλεν**, ver. 11.

Ver. 25. **παρακύψας**: in Sir. xiv. 20 ff. we read, **Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐν σοφίᾳ τελευτήσει . . . ὁ παρακύπτων διὰ τῶν θυρίδων αὐτῆς**. The word means literally to "peep into" with the idea of eagerness and concentration, see Gen. xxvi. 8; Mayor says that the **παρὰ** "seems to imply the bending of the upper part of the body horizontally"; if this is so the word would be used very appropriately of a man poring over a roll of the *Torah*. —**εἰς νόμον τέλειον . . .**: see above ver. 22.—**οὐκ ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς**, etc.: *Cf.* with this what is quoted as a saying of our Lord in the *Doctrina Addaei*: "Thus did the Lord command us, that that which we preach before the people by word we should practise in deed in the sight of all" (Resch., *op. cit.*, p. 285).—**ἐπιλησμονῆς**: does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., and only very rarely in the Septuagint; see Sir. xi. 27, **κάκωσις ὥρας ἐπιλησμονὴν ποιεῖ τρυφῆς**.—**ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ**: only here in the N.T., *cf.* Sir. xix. 18 (20 in Greek), **πᾶσα σοφία φόβος Κυρίου, καὶ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ ποίησις νόμου**; and li. 19, **καὶ ἐν ποιήσει μου** (B ℵ read **λιμοῦ**) **διηκριβασάμην** (this clause does not exist in the Hebrew, and is probably a doublet); *cf.* Sir. xvi. 26.

Vv. 26, 27. Although these verses are organically connected with the preceding section, they are self-contained, and deal with another aspect of religion. While the earlier verses, 19*b*-25, emphasise the need of doing as well as hearing, these speak of self-control in the matter of the tongue. At the same time it must be confessed that these verses would stand at least equally as well before iii. 1 ff.—**δοκεῖ**: the danger of regarding the *appearance* of religion as sufficient was the greater inasmuch as it was characteristic of a certain type of "religious" Jew, *cf.* Matt. vi. 1, 2, 5, 16; it must not, however, be supposed that this represented the normal type; the fact that the need of

καρδίαν ἑαυτοῦ,[1] τούτου[2] μάταιος ἡ [a]θρησκεία.[3] 27. θρησκεία[4] καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ[5] [b]Θεῷ καὶ[6] πατρὶ[7] αὕτη ἐστίν, [c]ἐπισκέπτεσθαι [d]ὀρφανοὺς καὶ χήρας[d] ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν, [e]ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν[8] [f]τηρεῖν ἀπὸ[9] τοῦ κόσμου.

II. 1. [a]Ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ ἐν [a]προσωπολημψίαις[10] ἔχετε τὴν [b]πί-

a Acts xxvi. 5. b iii. 9; Eph. v. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Col. ii. 2. c Sir. vii. 35; Matt. xxv. 36. d—d Job xxxi. 17-18; Isa. i. 17; Sir. iv. 10; 2 Macc. iii. 10, viii. 28, 30. e *Cf.* 2 Pet. iii. 14. f 1 Tim v. 22; 1 John v. 18; Rom. xii. 2. a Deut. i. 17, x. 17; Prov. xxiv. 23; 2 Cor. v. 16; 1 Pet i. 17; Jude 16. b Mark xi. 22.

[1] αυτου אACKL, Oec., Ti., Treg., WH (altern. reading).
[2] του א[1]. [3] θρησκια א Ti.
[4] θρησκια א Ti., add γαρ A, 70, 83, 123, Pesh.; add δε Syr[hk], latt., Copt.; add autem *ff*.
[5] Om. τω א[1]C[2]KL, curss., 40, 73, 99, Ti.
[6] Om. και 99, 126, *a*, *ff*, Pesh., Aeth. [7] Pr. τω A; om. *ff*.
[8] σεαυτον A, Aeth. [9] εκ CP. [10] -ληψιαις KLP, curss.

reality in religion is so frequently insisted upon by the early Rabbis shows that their teaching in this respect was the same as that of this writer.—**θρησκός**: Hatch, as quoted by Mayor, describes **θρησκεία** as "religion in its external aspect, as worship or as one mode of worship contrasted with another"; this agrees exactly with what has just been said. **θρησκός** does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. nor in the Septuagint.—**χαλιναγωγῶν**: (B reads **χαλινων**). Not found elsewhere in the N.T. or in the Septuagint; **χαλινός** is used in Ps. xxxi. (Heb. xxxii.) 9 in the Septuagint, as well as in the versions of Aquila and Quinta; for the thought *cf.* Ps. xxxviii. (Heb. xxxix.) 2, cxl. (Heb. cxli.) 3, though the word is not used in either of these last two passages. Mayor quotes the interesting passage from Hermas, *Mand.*, xii. 1. **ἐνδεδυμένος τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τὴν ἀγαθὴν μισήσεις τὴν πονηρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ χαλιναγωγήσεις αὐτήν.**—**γλῶσσαν ἑαυτοῦ**; the reference is to the threefold misuse of the tongue, slander, swearing and impure speaking; see Eph. v. 3-6.

Ver. 27. **θρησκεία καθαρὰ . . . αὕτη ἐστίν . . .**: As illustrating this, Dr. Taylor (*Expos. Times*, xvi. 334) quotes the **Ποίμανδρος** of Hermes Trismegistos: **καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ὁ θεός, τὸ πᾶν . . . τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, ὦ τέκνον, προσκύνει καὶ θρήσκευε. θρησκεία δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ μία ἐστί, μὴ εἶναι κακόν.** *Cf.* too, the following from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Jos. iv. 6: "The Lord willeth not that those who reverence Him should be in uncleanness, nor doth He take pleasure in them that commit adultery, but in those that approach Him with a pure heart and undefiled lips".—**ἐπισκέπτεσθαι ὀρφανοὺς καὶ . . . αὐτῶν**: this was reckoned among the גמילות חסדים "practice of kindnesses," which are constantly urged in Rabbinical writings, *e.g.*, *Nedarim*, 39*b*, 40*a*; *Ket.*, 50*a*; *Sanh.*, 19*b*. *Cf.* too, Sir. iv. 10, **γίνου ὀρφανοῖς ὡς πατήρ, καὶ ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῶν.** In the *Apoc. of Peter*, § 15, occur these words: **οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ πλουτοῦντες καὶ τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτῶν πεποιθότες καὶ μὴ ἐλεήσαντες ὀρφανοὺς καὶ χήρας, ἀλλ' ἀμελήσαντες τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ.** *Cf.* also the *Apoc. of Paul*, § 35.

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-13 take up again the subject of the rich and poor which was commenced in i. 9-11.

Ver. 1. **μὴ . . . ἔχετε**: the imperative, which is also found in all the versions, seems more natural and more in accordance with the style of the Epistle than the interrogative form adopted by WH.—**ἐν προσωπολημψίαις**: the plural form is due to Semitic usage, like **ἐξ αἱμάτων** in John i. 13; *cf.* Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25.—**τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Κυρίου . . .**: the mention of the "faith of Christ" is brought in in a way which shows that this was a matter with which the readers were well acquainted. The phrase must evidently mean the new religion which Christ gave to the world, *i.e.*, the Christian faith.—**τῆς δόξης**: the intensely Jewish character of this Epistle makes it reasonably certain that the familiar Jewish conception of the *Shekinah* is what the writer is here referring to. The *Shekinah* (from the root שכן "to dwell")

c 1 Cor. ii. 8; *cf.* Acts vii. 2. στιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[1] τῆς [c]δόξης.[2] 2. ἐὰν γὰρ[3] εἰσέλθῃ εἰς [d]συναγωγὴν[4] ὑμῶν ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος ἐν ἐσθῆτι [e]λαμ-

d Acts vi. 9, etc.; Heb. x.25. e Luke xxiii. 11.

[1] **Χριστου**, WH (altern. reading).

[2] Pesh. places **της δοξης** after **πιστιν**, so too 69, 73, *a*, *c*; it is om. by 13, Sah.; and rendered "honeris" by *ff*, though the Vulg. reads "gloriae". WH read **της δοξης**;

[3] Autem *ff*. [4] Pr. **την** אA[3]KLP, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.

denoted the visible presence of God dwelling among men. There are several references to it in the N.T. other than in this passage, Matt. ix. 7; Luke ii. 9; Acts vii. 2; Rom. ix. 4; *cf.* Heb. ix. 5; so, too, in the Targums, *e.g.*, in Targ. Onkelos to Num. vi. 25 ff. the "face (in the sense of appearance or presence) of the Lord" is spoken of as the *Shekinah*. A more materialistic conception is found in the Talmud, where the *Shekinah* appears in its relationship with men as one person dealing with another; *e.g.*, in *Sota*, 3*b*, it is said that before Israel sinned the *Shekinah* dwelt with every man severally, but that after they sinned it was taken away; *cf. Sota*, 17*a*, where it is said: "Man and wife, if they be deserving, have the *Shekinah* between them"; so, too, *Pirqe Aboth.*, iii. 3: "Rabbi Chananiah ben Teradyon [he lived in the second century, A.D.] said, Two that sit together and are occupied in words of *Torah* have the *Shekinah* among them" (*cf.* Matt. xviii. 20); see further Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, pp. 191-194. The *Shekinah* was thus used by Jews as an indirect expression in place of God, the localised presence of the Deity. "In the identification of the *Shekinah* and cognate conceptions with the incarnate Christ, 'a use is made of these ideas,' as Dalman says, 'which is at variance with their primary application'. It marks a specifically Christian development, though the way had certainly been prepared by hypostatising tendencies" (Box, in Hastings' DCG., ii. 622*a*). That Christ was often identified with the Divine *Shekinah* may be seen from the examples given by Friedländer, *Patristische und Talmudische Studien*, pp. 62 ff. If our interpretation of **δόξα** here is correct, it will follow, in the first place, that the meaning of the phrase . . . **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης** is free from ambiguity, *viz.*, ". . . Have faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the *Shekinah*" (literally "the glory"); this is precisely the same thought that is contained in the words, ". . . who being the effulgence of his glory . . . (Heb. i. 2-3). And, in the second place, this rendering shows that the words are an expression of the Divinity of our Lord; *cf.* Bengel's note: "**τῆς δόξης**: est appositio, ut ipse Christus dicatur **ἡ δόξα**". [Since writing the above the present writer finds that Mayor, p. 78, refers to Mr. Bassett's comment on this verse, where the same interpretation is given, together with a number of O.T. quotations; it seems scarcely possible to doubt that this interpretation is the correct one.]

Ver. 2. **εἰς συναγωγὴν ὑμῶν**: as the Epistle is addressed to the twelve tribes of the Dispersion no particular synagogue can be meant here; it is a general direction that is being given. In the N.T. the word is always used of a *Jewish* place of worship; but it is used of a *Christian* place of worship by Hermas, *Mand.*, xi. 9. **. . . εἰς συναγωγὴν ἀνδρῶν δικαίων . . . καὶ ἔντευξις γένηται πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων.** Harnack (*Expansion . . .* i. 60) says: "I know one early Christian fragment, hitherto unpublished, which contains the expression: **Χριστιανοί τε καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι Χριστὸν ὁμολογοῦντες**". This latter may well refer to a place of worship in which converted Gentiles and Jewish-Christians met together. And this is probably the sense in which we must understand the use of the word in the verse before us. The Jewish name for the synagogue was בית הכנסת ("house of assembly"); according to *Shabbath*, 32*a*, the more popular designation was the Aramaic name בית עמא ("house of the people"); Hellenistic Jews used the term **προσευχή** = **οἶκος προσευχῆς** as well as **συναγωγή**.—**ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος**, etc.: *Cf.* Sir. xi. 2, **μὴ αἰνέσῃς ἄνδρα ἐν κάλλει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ βδέλυξῃ ἄνθρωπον ἐν ὁράσει αὐτοῦ.** For **ἀνήρ** see note on ver. 7. **χρυσοδακτύλιος** does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. nor in the Septuagint; *cf.* Luke

πρᾷ, εἰσέλθῃ δὲ καὶ[1] πτωχὸς ἐν ῥυπαρᾷ ἐσθῆτι, 3. [f]ἐπιβλέψητε δὲ[2] ἐπὶ τὸν φοροῦντα τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν [g]λαμπρὰν καὶ εἴπητε[3]· σὺ κάθου ὧδε καλῶς, καὶ τῷ πτωχῷ εἴπητε· σὺ στῆθι ἐκεῖ[4] ἢ κάθου[5] ὑπὸ[6] τὸ ὑποπόδιόν[7] μου,[8] 4. οὐ[9] [h]διεκρίθητε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐγένεσθε [i]κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν [1]πονηρῶν; 5. Ἀκούσατε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί· [k]οὐχ ὁ Θεὸς [k]ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ[10] πλουσίους ἐν [1]πίστει

f Luke i. 48.
g Luke xxiii. 11.
h iii. 17; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 1.
i Matt. xv. 19.
k Eph. i. 4; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28; *cf.* Job xxxiv. 19.
l Prov. iii. 7; Luke xii. 21; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Rev. ii. 9.

[1] δε και is rendered "autem" by *ff*.
[2] και επιβλ. אAKL, Oec., Ti., Treg., rec. [3] Add αυτω KLP, Vulg., Oec.
[4] *Pon post* καθου 2°B, *ff*, WH marg.
[5] Pr. ωδε אC²KLP, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.
[6] επι B³P, 13, 29, 69, *a*, *c*, *d*, Pesh., Arm., Sah.
[7] Add των ποδων A, 13, Vulg., Syr., Aeth. [8] Eorum *s*.
[9] Pr. και KLP, *a*, Thl., Oec., rec. B¹, *ff*, WH marg. do not make it interrogative.
[10] του κοσμου A²C²KLP, *a*, Pesh.; του κοσμου τουτου Aeth., Oec.; εν τω κοσμω τουτω 29, Vulg.; pr. εν 27, 43, 64, om. 113.

xv. 22. λαμπρᾷ, probably in reference to the fine white garment worn by wealthy Jews.—πτωχὸς ἐν ῥυπαρᾷ ἐσθῆτι: ῥυπαρός occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Rev. xxii. 11 (*cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 21) and very rarely in the Septuagint, see Zech. iii. 3, 4; in the *Apoc. of Peter* we have, in § 15, . . . γυναῖκες καὶ ἄνδρες ῥάκη ῥυπαρὰ ἐνδεδυμένοι . . .—There is nothing decisive to show whether the rich man or the poor man (presumably not regular worshippers), who are thus described as entering the Synagogue, were Christians or otherwise; on the assumption of an early date for the Epistle they might have been either; but if the Epistle be regarded as belonging to the first half of the second century non-Christians are probably those referred to; but it would be futile to attempt to speak definitely here, for a good case can be made out for any class of worshipper.

Ver. 3. ἐπιβλέψητε: "look upon with admiration," the exact force of the word is conditioned by the context; it quite expresses the Hebrew פנה אל, the meaning of which varies according to the context, *e.g.*, in Ps. xxv. 16 (Sept. xxiv. 16) it is "to look graciously," in Deut. ix. 27, "to look sternly".—σὺ κάθου ὧδε καλῶς: the reference is to the kind of seat rather than to its position; chairs, or something corresponding to these, were provided for the elders and scribes (*cf.* Matt. xxiii. 6; Mark xii. 39; Luke xi. 43), and would no doubt have been offered to persons of rank who might enter, while the poorer men would sit on the floor, which is indeed clearly implied by the words ὑπὸ τὸ ὑποπόδιόν μου. The official who directed people to their seats was called the חזן (*Chazzan*) *i.e.*, the man who "had charge"; we read of the existence of this official in the Synagogue within the Temple precints in Jerusalem (*Yoma*, vii. 1).

Ver. 4. οὐ διεκρίθητε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς: "Are ye not divided among yourselves"? The Peshiṭṭa uses the word אתפלג, the same as that used in Luke xi. 17. "Every Kingdom divided against itself." The reference in the verse before us might be to the class distinctions which were thus being made, and which would have the effect of engendering envy and strife, and thus divisions.—κριταί: the Peshiṭṭâ has the interesting rendering מפרשנא (instead of the usual word for "judge" דינא), which comes from the root meaning "to divide".—διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν: *Cf.* Matt. xv. 19, ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἔρχονται διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί: genitive of quality, "judges with evil surmisings," *viz.*, of breaking up the unity of the worshippers by differentiating between their worldly status; the writer is very modern! διαλογισμοί is generally used in a bad sense, *cf.* Luke v. 21, 22; Rom. i. 21.

Ver. 5. Ἀκούσατε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί: This expression, which one would expect to hear rather in a vigorous address, reveals the writer as one who was also an impassioned speaker;

m Matt. xxv. 34. καὶ [m] κληρονόμους τῆς [n] βασιλείας [1] ἧς [o] ἐπηγγείλατο [2] τοῖς ἀγαπῶ-
n Matt. v. 3; Luke vi. 20, xii. 32. σιν [p] αὐτόν; 6. ὑμεῖς δὲ [q] ἠτιμάσατε τὸν πτωχόν. οὐχ [3] οἱ πλούσιοι
o i. 12. p Exod. xx. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 9; *cf.* Prov. viii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 8. q v. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 22.

[1] επαγγελιας א*A (*cf.* Heb. vi. 17).
[2] Pr. ο θεος Pesh. [3] ουχι AC[1], *a*, *c*, 69, 180.

cf. in the same spirit, the frequent **ἀδελφοί**, and especially, **ἄγε νῦν**, iv. 13, v. i.—**ἐξελέξατο**: a very significant term in the mouth of a Jew when addressing Jews; *cf.* Deut. xiv. 1-2, **Υἱοί ἐστε Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν . . . ὅτι λαὸς ἅγιος εἶ Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ σου, καὶ σὲ ἐξελέξατο Κύριος ὁ θεός σου γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον . . .** *cf.* Acts. xiii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 27. There is an interesting saying in *Chag.* 9*b* where it is said that poverty is the quality most befitting Israel as the chosen people.—**πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ**: *i.e.*, poor in the estimation of the world; the reading **τοῦ κόσμου** or **ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ** loses this point; *cf.* Matt. x. 9; Luke vi. 20.—**πλουσίους ἐν πίστει**: "Oblique predicate" (Mayor). In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Gad. vii. 6 we read: "For the poor man, if, free from envy, he pleaseth the Lord in all things, is blessed beyond all men" (the Greek text reads **πλουτεῖ** which Charles holds to be due to a corruption in the original Hebrew text which reads אַשְׁרֵי = **μακαριστός ἐστι**). See, for the teaching of our Lord, Matt. vi. 19; Luke xii. 21. **Πίστις** is used here rather in the sense of trust than in the way in which it is used in ii. 1.—**κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας**: the Kingdom must refer to that of the Messiah, see v. 7-9, and Matt. xxv. 35, **δεῦτε οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου**, but not Matt. v. 3 which treats of a different subject. It is of importance to remember that the Messianic Kingdom to which reference is made in this verse was originally, among the Jews, differentiated from the "future life" which is apparently referred to in i. 12, **. . . λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.** There was a distinction, fundamentally present, though later on confused, in Jewish theology, between the "Kingdom of Heaven" over which God reigns, and that of the Kingdom of Israel over which the Messiah should reign. An integral part of the Messianic hope was the doctrine of a resurrection (*cf.* Isa. xxiv. 10; Dan. xii. 2). This first assumed definite form, apparently, under the impulse of the idea that those who had suffered martyrdom for the Law (*Torah*) were worthy to share in the future glories of Israel. In the crudest form of the doctrine the resurrection was confined to the Holy Land—those buried elsewhere would have to burrow through the ground to Palestine—and to Israelites. And the trumpet-blast which was to be the signal for the ingathering of the exiles would also arouse the sleeping dead (*cf. Berachoth*, 15*b*, 4 Esdras iv. 23 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16). According to the older view, the Kingdom was to follow the resurrection and judgment; but the later and more widely held view was that a temporary Messianic Kingdom would be established on the earth, and that this would be followed by the Last Judgment and the Resurrection which would close the Messianic Era. This was to be followed by a new heaven and a new earth. In the eschatological development which took place during the first century B.C. Paradise came to be regarded as the abode of the righteous and elect in an intermediate state; from there they will pass to the Messianic Kingdom, and then, after the final judgment they enter heaven and eternal life. In our Epistle there are some reflections of these various conceptions and beliefs, but they have entered into a simpler and more spiritual phase. That the reference in the verse before us is to the Messianic Kingdom seems indubitable both on account of the mention of the "Lord Jesus Christ" (Messiah) with which the section opens, showing that the thought of our Lord was in the mind of the writer, and because of the mention of the "Kingdom," and also on account of the direct mention of the coming of the Messiah as Judge, later on in v. 7-9. And if this is so then we may perhaps see in the words **ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο** a reference to Christ.

Ver. 6. **ἠτιμάσατε**: *Cf.*, though in an entirely different connection, Sir. x. 23, **οὐ δίκαιον ἀτιμάσαι πτωχὸν συνετόν** (**δίκαιον** is absent in the Hebrew);

r καταδυναστεύουσιν ὑμῶν,[1] καὶ αὐτοὶ[2] s ἕλκουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς t κριτήρια ; 7. οὐκ[3] αὐτοὶ u βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ καλὸν v ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν[4] ἐφ' s Acts xvi. 19.

t Acts viii. 3, xiii. 50, xvii. 6, xviii. 12. *cf.* Jer. vii. 10; Mal. i. 11.

u 1 Tim. vi. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 14; *cf.* Acts xiii. 45.

v Acts xv. 17;

[1] υμας א[1]A, 19, 20, 65, Ti. [2] αυτοι και *s*.
[3] και A, *c*, 13, Syr[hk], Aeth. [4] επικεκληθεν C[1].

the R.V. "dishonoured" accurately represents the Greek, but the equivalent Hebrew word would be better rendered "despised" which is what the A.V. has. "Dishonouring" would imply the withholding of a right, "despising" would be rather the contempt accorded to the man because he was poor. There can be little doubt that it is the former which is intended here, but the idea of the latter must also have been present.—**οὐχ οἱ πλούσιοι καταδυναστεύουσιν ὑμῶν** : the rich here probably refer to wealthy Jews, though it does not follow that "there could have been no question of *rich Jews* if the city and the temple had fallen" (Knowling), for the Epistle was addressed to Jews of the Dispersion, the bulk of whom were not affected, as far as their worldly belongings were concerned, by the Fall of Jerusalem. On the other hand, the possibility of the reference being to rich Jewish-Christians, or Gentile-Christians, cannot be dismissed off-hand, for on the assumption of a late date for the Epistle it is more likely that these would be meant. The writer is taxing his hearers both with bad treatment accorded to the poor, as well as pusillanimity with regard to the rich. The word **καταδυν.** only occurs once elsewhere in the N.T., Acts x. 38, **. . . πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου**; but fairly frequently in the Septuagint, *e.g.*, Am. viii, 4; Wisd. ii. 10, xv. 14. The accusative **ὑμᾶς**, which is the reading of א[1]A, etc., is in accordance with the frequent usage of the Septuagint, where **καταδυν.** often takes an accusative instead of the genitive.—**αὐτοὶ** : "The pronoun **αὐτὸς** is used in the nominative, not only with the meaning 'self' when attached to a subject, as in classical Greek, but also when itself standing for the subject, with a less amount of emphasis, which we might render 'he for his part,' or 'it was he who,' as in the next clause; it is disputed whether it does not in some cases lose its emphatic force altogether, as in Luke xix. 2, xxiv. 31" (Mayor). **ἕλκουσιν**: See Matt. x. 7, 18. *Cf.* Acts xvi. 19, **. . . ἐπιλαβόμενοι τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σίλαν εἵλκυσαν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας.**—**κριτήρια**: *Cf.* 1 Cor. vi 2, 4, either Jewish (*cf.* the Peshiṭtâ rendering בית דינא) tribunals or Gentile ones.

Ver. 7. **βλασφημοῦσιν**: for the force of the word *cf.* Sir. iii. 16, **ὡς βλάσφημος ὁ ἐγκαταλιπὼν** (the Greek is certainly wrong here, the Hebrew has ברוה, "he that despiseth") **πατέρα.** *Cf.* Rom. ii. 24, **τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** (Isa. lii. 5); the word in the N.T. is sometimes general in its application, of evil speaking with regard to men (in the *Apoc. of Peter* the phrase, **οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης** occurs twice, 7, 13); at other times, specifically with reference to God or our Lord.—**τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς**: the *name* here (especially in view of **καλόν**) must be "Jesus" (Saviour), for the Jews would not be likely to have blasphemed the name of "Christ" (Messiah); in Acts iv. 10-12 it is also the name of "Jesus," concerning which St. Peter says: *Neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved.* **τὸ ἐπικλ. ἐφ. ὑμ.** is a Hebraism, in Am. ix. 12 we have: אשר נקרא שמי עליהם, which the R.V. renders (incorrectly): "which are called by my name," it should be: "Over whom my name was called," as rendered by the Septuagint, excepting that it repeats itself unnecessarily, **ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς.** The Peshiṭtâ, too, has, שמא טבא דאתקרי so that the R.V. rendering here is incorrect, though the margin has "which was called upon you". The idea which the phrase expresses is very ancient; a possession was known by the name of the possessor (originally always a god), this was the name which was pronounced over, or concerning, the land; in the same way, a slave was known under the name of his master, it was the name under whose protection he stood. And

w Matt. xxii. 38; John xiii. 34; *cf.* Gal. vi. 2.
x *Cf.* ii. 23.
y—y Quoted from Lev. xix. 18; *cf.* Rom. xiii. 9.
z Deut. i. 17.

ὑμᾶς; 8. εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε [w]βασιλικὸν[1] κατὰ τὴν [x]γραφήν· [y]ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν,[2][y] καλῶς ποιεῖτε. 9. εἰ δὲ [z]προσωπολημπτεῖτε,[3] ἁμαρτίαν ἐργάζεσθε, ἐλεγχόμενοι ὑπὸ

[1] βασιλικον τελειτε C, Syrhk; τον βασ. P.
[2] ως σαυτον B; ως εαυτον 4, 25, 28, 31, 36, Thl.; ως εαυτους *a*.
[3] -λημπτειτε KLP.

so also different peoples were ranged under the names of special gods; this usage was the same among the Israelites, who stood under the protection of Jahwe —the name and the bearer were of course not differentiated. This, too, is the meaning here; it does not mean the name that they bore, or were called by, but the name under whose protection they stood, and to which they belonged. Parallel to it was the marking of cattle to denote ownership. (See, in reference to what has been said, Deut. xxviii. 10; 2 Sam. xii. 28; Jer. vii. 10). In the passage before us there is not *necessarily* any reference to Baptism, though it is extremely probable that this is so; Mayor quotes Hermas, *Sim.* ix. 16, **πρὶν φορέσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ νεκρός ἐστιν· ὅταν δὲ λάβῃ τὴν σφραγῖδα** (baptism) **ἀποτίθεται τὴν νέκρωσιν καὶ ἀναλαμβάνει τὴν ζωήν.** Resch (*op cit.* p. 193) quotes a very interesting passage from Agathangelus, chap. 73, in which these words occur: **. . . καὶ εἰπὼν ὅτι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπικέκληται ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ναὸς τῆς θεότητός μου.** In the passage before us, the omission of all mention of the name, which would have come in very naturally, betrays Jewish usage; as Taylor truly remarks (*Pirqe Aboth.*, p. 66): "A feeling of reverence leads the Jews to avoid, as far as possible, all mention of the Names of God. This feeling is manifested . . . in their post-canonical literature, even with regard to less sacred, and not incommunicable Divine names. In the Talmud and Midrash. and (with the exception of the Prayer Books) in the Rabbinic writings generally, it is the custom to abstain from using the Biblical names of God, *excepting in citations from the Bible;* and even when *Elohim* is necessarily brought in, it is often intentionally misspelt . . ." It should be noted that this phrase only occurs once elsewhere in the N.T., and there in a quotation from the O.T., quoted by St. James in Acts xv. 17.

Ver. 8. **μέντοι**: "nevertheless"; there is a duty due to all men, even the rich are to be regarded as "neighbours," for the precept of the Law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. xix. 18), applies to all men.—**νόμον βασιλικόν**: "There is no difficulty in the anarthrous **νόμος** being used (as below, iv. 11) for the law of Christ or of Moses on the same principle that **βασιλεύς** could be used for the King of Persia, but the addition of an anarthrous epithet should not have been passed over without comment, as it has been by the editors generally" (Mayor). The reference is to the *Torah*, as is obvious from the quotation from Lev. xix. 18, and therefore **βασιλικόν**—if this was the original reading—must refer to God, not (in the first instance) to Christ; the Peshiṭṭâ reads: "the law of God".—**τελεῖτε**: in Rom. ii. 27 we have the phrase **νόμον τελεῖτε.—τὴν γραφήν**: *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 3 **κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.** On a papyrus belonging to the beginning of the Christian era, the phrase **κατὰ τὴν γραφήν** is used in a legal sense in reference to a contract, *i.e.*, *something that is binding* (Deissmann, *Neue Bibelst.*, p. 78). When used in reference to the *Torah*, as here, it was of particular significance to Jews who, as the "people of God" were bound by the Covenant.—**καλῶς ποιεῖτε**: *Cf.* Acts xv. 29; 2 Pet. i. 19.

Ver. 9. **προσωπολημπτεῖτε**: see note on ii. 1; the word does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. nor in the Septuagint; *cf.* Lev. xix. 15; Deut. xvi. 19.—**ἁμαρτίαν ἐργάζεσθε**: the strength of the expression is intended to remind his hearers that it is wilful, conscious sin of which they will be guilty, if they have this respect for persons on account of their wealth. It is well to bear in mind that the conception of sin among the Jews was not so deep as it became in the light of Christian teaching.—**ἐλεγχόμενοι**: *i.e.*, by the words in Lev. xix. 15., **μὴ θαυμάσῃς πρόσωπον δυνάστου.—παραβάται**: the verb **παραβαίνω**

τοῦ νόμου ὡς παραβάται. 10. ὅστις[1] γὰρ[2] ὅλον τὸν νόμον τηρήσῃ,[3] [a]πταίσῃ[4] δὲ ἐν [b]ἑνί, γέγονεν πάντων [c]ἔνοχος. 11. ὁ γὰρ εἰπών[5]· [d 6]μὴ μοιχεύσῃς,[7] εἶπεν καί· μὴ φονεύσῃς[d 6]. εἰ δὲ οὐ [8]μοιχεύεις, φονεύεις[8] δέ, γέγονας[9] παραβάτης[10] νόμου. 12. οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε ὡς διὰ νόμου [e]ἐλευθερίας μέλλοντες κρίνε-

a iii. 2; 2 Pet. i. 10; Jude 24.
b Matt. v. 19.
c Mark iii. 29; Gal. iii. 10.
d—d Quoted from Exod. xx. 13, 14; *cf.* Deut. v. 17, 18.
e i. 25.

[1] Qui *ff.* [2] Autem Vulg.

[3] τηρησει KLP; πληρωσει A, *a*, *c*, 63, 69, Syr^{hk}; πληρωσας τηρησει 13; τελεσει 66, 73.

[4] πταισει KLP. [5] ειπας A. [6—6] Transp. C, 69, Syr^{hk}, Arm., Thl.
[7] μοιχευσεις L. [8—8] Transp. 15, 70, Arm.; -σεις K, Thl.; -σης LP.
[9] εγενου AB. [10] αποστατης A.

precisely expresses the Hebrew עבר "to cross over"; *cf.* Rom. ii. 25, 27; Gal. ii. 18; Heb. ii. 2, ix. 15, and see Matt. xv. 2, 3. To cross over the line which marks the "way" is to become a transgressor.

Ver. 10. **τηρήσῃ**: **τηρεῖν** is used here with a force precisely corresponding to the Hebrew שָׁמַר when used in reference to the Law, or a statute, the Sabbath, etc.; the idea is that of guarding something against violation.—**πταίσῃ δὲ ἐν ἑνί**: **πταίειν** = the Hebrew כָּשַׁל, "to stumble over" something; the picture is that of a **παραβάτης** stumbling over the border which marks the way; *cf.* the oft-used expression in Jewish writings of making a "hedge" or "fence" around the *Torah*, *e.g.*, *Pirqe Aboth.*, i. 1. With the verse before us *cf.* Sir. xxxvii. 12, . . . **ὃν ἂν ἐπιγνῷς συντηροῦντα ἐντολάς . . . καὶ ἐὰν πταίσῃς συναλγήσει σοι,** and ver. 15 **καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις δεήθητι Ὑψίστου ἵνα εὐθύνῃ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τὴν ὁδόν σου.**—**ἐν ἑνί**: used in a pregnant sense, "in one matter" or "in any single point".—**γέγονεν πάντων ἔνοχος**: While there are a certain number of passages in Rabbinical writings which are in agreement with this teaching (*e.g.*, *Bemidbar Rabb.*, ix. on Num. v. 14; *Shabbath*, 70*b*; *Pesikta*, 50*a*; *Horaioth*, 8*b*; quoted by Mayor), there can be no doubt that the predominant teaching was in accordance with the passage quoted by Taylor (in Mayor, *op. cit.*, p. 89) from *Shemoth Rabb.* xxv. end: "The Sabbath weighs against all the precepts"; as Taylor goes on to say: "If they kept it, they were to be reckoned as having done all; if they profaned it, as having broken all". Rashi teaches the same principle. This is quite in accordance with the Jewish teaching regarding the accumulation of מצוות ("commandments," *i.e.*, observances of the Law); a man was regarded as "righteous" or "evil" according to the relative number of מצוות or evil deeds laid to his account; the good were balanced against the bad; according as to which of the two preponderated, so was the man reckoned as among the righteous or the wicked (see the writer's article in the *Expositor*, April, 1908, "The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard").—**πάντων** is equivalent to all the precepts of the *Torah*. For **ἔνοχος** *cf.* Matt. xxvi. 66; 1 Cor. xi. 27; Gal. iii. 10; see also Deut. xxvii. 26, and Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

Ver. 11. **μὴ μοιχεύσῃς**, etc.: for the order of the seventh commandment preceding the sixth, *cf.* the Septuagint (Exod. xx. 13, 14), and Luke xviii. 20; Rom. xiii. 9. With this mention of adultery and murder together should be compared §§ 9, 10 of the *Apoc of Peter;* in the former section the punishment of adulterers is described, in the latter that of murderers, while in § 11 mention is made of the children who were the victims of murder. Possibly it is nothing more than a coincidence, but the fact is worth drawing attention to that in the *Apoc.* of *Peter* (or, more strictly, in the extant remains of this) the punishment is described only of those who had been guilty of evil speaking (blasphemy), adultery, murder, and the wealthy who had not had pity upon widows and orphans. These are the sins upon which special stress is laid in our Epistle; other sins receive only incidental mention.

Ver. 12. **οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε**: When one thinks of

σθαι. 13. [f]ἡ γὰρ[1] κρίσις ἀνέλεος[2] τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος[3]·
κατακαυχᾶται[4] ἔλεος[5] κρίσεως.[g] 14. Τί τὸ[6] [h]ὄφελος, ἀδελφοί μου, ἐὰν πίστιν λέγῃ τις[7] ἔχειν·

f—f Job xxii. 6-11; Prov. xxi. 13; Ezek. xxxv. 11; Matt. v. 7, vi. 15, xviii. 29, 34, 35, xxv. 45, 46; Mark xi. 26; Luke vi. 38, xvi. 35; *cf.* Rom. i. 31. g i. 9; iii. 14. h 1 Cor. xv. 32.

[1] Autem *ff*. [2] ανιλεως L, *a*, Chrys., Thl., rec., non miserebitur, *ff*. [3] ελεον K.
[4] κατακαυχασθω A, 13, 27, *a*, Copt.; κατακαυχατε B; κατακαυχασθε C^{2ras}, Pesh., + δε א^{3}A, 13, + autem, Vulg., *a*, *ff*, Syrr., Oec.
[5] ελεον CKL, Oec. [6] Om. το BC^{1}, Arm., Tregmg; WH.
[7] τις λεγη AC, Tregmg.

the teaching of our Lord in such passages as Matt. v. 22, 28, where sinful feelings and thoughts are reckoned as equally wicked with sinful words and acts, it is a little difficult to get away from the impression that in the verse before us the teaching is somewhat inadequate from the Christian, though not from the Jewish, point of view.—**διὰ νόμου ἐλευθερίας**: See above i. 22, 25, and *cf.* John vii. 32-36.—**μέλλοντες κρίνεσθαι**: *cf.* ver. 7, 8, and especially ver. 9, **ἰδοὺ ὁ κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἕστηκεν.**

Ver. 13. **ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος**, etc.: *Cf.* Matt. v. 7, vii. 1, xviii. 28 ff., xxv. 41 ff. For the form **ἀνέλεος** see Mayor, *in loc.* The teaching occurs often in Jewish writings, *e.g.*, Sir. xxviii. 1, 2, **ὁ ἐκδικῶν παρὰ Κυρίου εὑρήσει ἐκδίκησιν, καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ διαστηριῶν διαστηρίσει. ἄφες ἀδίκημα τῷ πλησίον σου, καὶ τότε δεηθέντος σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου λυθήσονται.** *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Zeb. viii. 1-3: "Have, therefore, yourselves also, my children, compassion towards every man with mercy, that the Lord also may have compassion and mercy upon you. Because also in the last days God will send His compassion on the earth, and wheresoever He findeth bowels of mercy He dwelleth in him. For in the degree in which a man hath compassion upon his neighbours, in the same degree hath the Lord also upon him" (Charles); *cf.* also vi. 4-6. *Shabbath*, 127*b*: "He who thus judges others will thus himself be judged". *Ibid.*, 151*b*: "He that hath mercy on his neighbours will receive mercy from heaven; and he that hath not mercy on his neighbours will not receive mercy from heaven". *Cf.* also the following from Ephraem Syrus, *Opp.*, I. 30E (quoted by Resch. *op. cit.*, p. 197): **καὶ μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήσαντες, ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐλεηθήσονται· καὶ οὐαὶ τοῖς μὴ ἐλεήσασιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐλεηθήσονται.**—**ποιήσαντι**: this use of **ποιεῖν** is common in the Septuagint and corresponds to the Hebrew עשה; it is often used with חסד ("kindness").—**κατακαυχᾶται**: "triumphs over".

Vv. 14-26. On this section see Introduction IV., § 2. There are a few points worth drawing attention to, in connection with the subject treated of in these verses, before we come to deal with the passage in detail: (1) **πίστις** here means nothing more than belief in the unity of God, *cf.* ver. 20 **τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν . . .**; this is a very restricted use of the word, both according to Hebrew and Greek usage. The Hebrew אמונה means primarily "faithfulness," "steadfastness," "reliability," and is used in reference to God quite as much as in reference to men. This is also the force of the verb אמן; it is only in the Hiph'al that the meaning "to believe in," in the sense of "to trust," arises. The use of **πίστις** in the Septuagint varies; mostly it corresponds to אמונה, but not infrequently this latter is rendered **ἀλήθεια**, *e.g.*, Psa. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 34, 50, xcvii. (xcviii.) 3, though in each of these cases Aquila and Quinta render **πίστις**. In Sir. xli. 16, **πίστις** is the rendering of the Hebrew אמת ("truth"), while in xlv. 4, xlvi. 15 it corresponds to אמונה in the sense of "reliability". In Sir. xxxvii. 26 the Greek is obviously corrupt, **πίστις** stands there for the Hebrew כבוד ("glory"), which is clearly more correct. But the most interesting passage on the subject in Sir. from our present point of view is xv. 15: **ἐὰν θέλῃς, συντηρήσεις ἐντολάς, καὶ πίστιν ποίησαι εὐδοκίας**; of which the Hebrew is: אם תחפץ תשמר מצוה ואמונה לעשות רצונו ("If it be thy will thou dost observe the

ἔργα δὲ μὴ [1]ἔχῃ; μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις [1]σῶσαι αὐτόν; 15. ἐὰν [2] i. 23; Matt. vii. 21; *cf.* xxi. 29.

[1] Add sola, *ff*; add sine operibus, Sah.
[2] Add δε ACDKL, curss., Vulg., rec.

commandment, and it is faithfulness to do His good pleasure"; the context shows that it is a question here of man's free-will). Here πίστις is used in a distinctly higher sense than in the passage of our Epistle under consideration. In so far, therefore, as πίστις is used in the restricted sense, as something which demons as well as men possess, it is clear that the subject is different from that treated by St. Paul in Romans; and therefore the comparison so often made between the two Epistles on this point is not *à propos*. (2) That which gave the occasion for this section seems to have been the fact that, in the mind of the writer, some of the Jewish converts had gone from one extreme to another on the subject of *works*. Too much stress had been laid upon the efficacy of works in their Jewish belief; when they became Christians they were in danger of losing some of the excellences of their earlier faith by a mistaken supposition that works, not being efficacious *per se* (which so far was right) were therefore altogether unnecessary, and that the mere fact of believing in the unity of God was sufficient. Regarded from this point of view, there can, again, be no question of a conflict with Pauline teaching as such. The point of controversy was one which must have agitated every centre in which Jews and Jewish-Christians were found. In this connection it is important to remember that the "faith of Abraham" was a subject which was one of the commonplaces of theological discussion both in Rabbinical circles as well as in the Hellenistic School of Alexandria; regarding the former, see the interesting passage from the Midrashic work, *Mechilta*, quoted by Box in Hastings' *D.C.G.*, ii. 568*b*. The error of running from one extreme into another, in matters of doctrine, is one of those things too common to human nature for the similarity of language between this Epistle and St. Paul's writings in dealing with the subject of faith and works to denote antagonism between the two writers. (3) The passage as a whole betrays a very strong Jewish standpoint; while it would be too much to say that it could not have been written by a Christian, it is certainly difficult to understand how, *e.g.*, ver. 25 could have come from the pen of a Christian. (4) It is necessary to emphasise the fact that this passage cannot be properly understood without some idea of the subject of the Jewish doctrine of works which has always played a supremely important part in Judaism; for this, reference must be made to IV., § 2 of the Introduction, where various authorities are quoted..

Ver. 14. τί τὸ ὄφελος: B stands almost alone in omitting τό here; in 1 Cor. xv. 32, the only other place in the N.T. where the phrase occurs τό is inserted. A somewhat similar phrase occurs in Sir. xli. 14, . . . τίς ὠφελία ἐν ἀμφοτέροις; the abruptness of the words betrays the preacher.—ἀδελφοί μου: a characteristic mode of address in this Epistle. With ἀδελφός *cf.* חבר in Rabbinical literature.—ἔργα: = the Hebrew מצוות (literally "command; ments," *i.e.*, fulfilling of commandments): see Introduction IV., § 2.—πίστις. *i.e.*, as expressed in the *Shema'* (Deut. vi, 4 ff.): "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One . . ."; this was the fundamental tenet of the Jewish faith, and that it is this to which reference is made, and not the Christian faith, is obvious from ver. 19 which contains the essence of the *Shema'*.—σῶσαι: the belief in the efficacy of works among the Jews has always been very strong; the following quotations express the traditional teaching of Judaism on the subject: "He that does a good work in this world, in the world to come his good work goes before him;" *Sota*, 3*b*, in *Kethuboth*, 67*b* we have the following: "When Mar Ukba lay a-dying, he asked for his account; it amounted to 7000 Zuzim (*i.e.*, this was the sum-total of his almsgiving). Then he cried out. 'The way is far, and the provision *is* small' (*i.e.*, he did not think that this sum would be sufficient to ensure his justification in the sight of God, and thus gain him salvation); so he gave away half of his fortune, in order to make himself quite secure." Again, concerning a righteous man who died in the odour of sanctity, it is said, in *Tanchuma, Wayyakel*, i.: "How much alms did he give, how much did he study the *Torah*, how many *Mitzvoth* (*i.e.*,

k Luke iii. 11; *cf.* Lev. xxv. 35; Job xxii. 6, xxxi. 19, 20. k ὑπάρχωσιν καὶ λειπόμενοι [1] τῆς ἐφη- 1—11 John iii. 17, 18. μέρου τροφῆς, 16. [1]εἴπῃ [2] δέ [3] τις [4] αὐτοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν· ὑπάγετε [5] ἐν

[1] Add ωσιν ALP, *m*, Thl., Oec., rec. [2] ειπει א[1].
[3] και ειπη A, 13, *a*. [4] τι א[1]. [5] υπαγε C[1] vid, 63.

'commandments,' see above) did he fulfil! He will rest among the righteous." It is also said in *Baba Bathra* 10*a*, that God placed the poor on earth in order to save rich men from Hell; the idea, of course, being that opportunities for doing *Mitzvoth* were thus provided. In a curious passage in the *Testament of Abraham*, chap. xvi., it is said that Thanatos met Abraham and told him that he welcomed the righteous with a pleasant look and with a salutation of peace, but the sinners he confronted with an angry and dark countenance; and he said that the good deeds of Abraham had become a crown upon his (Thanatos') head. In *Wisdom*, iv. 1 we have, . . . **ἀθανασία γάρ ἐστιν ἐν μνήμῃ αὐτῆς (ἀρετῆς), ὅτι καὶ παρὰ Θεῷ γινώσκεται καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις.** *Cf.* Enoch ciii. 1-4.

Ver. 15. In accordance with the very practical nature of the writer, he now proceeds to give an illustration of his thesis which is bound to appeal; he must have been a telling preacher.—**ἐὰν**: the addition of **δέ** is fairly well attested, but the reading of Bא where it is omitted is to be preferred.—**ἀδελφή**: the specific mention of "sister" here is noteworthy; it is the one point in this passage which suggests distinctively Christian influence. This is apparently the only place in the Bible in which "sister" is mentioned in this special connection.—**γυμνοί**: *Cf. Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Zeb. vii. 1-3; "I saw a man in distress through nakedness in winter-time, and had compassion upon him, and stole away a garment secretly from my father's house (another reading is 'my house'), and gave it to him who was in distress. Do you, therefore, my children, from that which God bestoweth on you, show compassion and mercy without hesitation to all men, and give to every man with a good heart. And if you have not the wherewithal to give to him that needeth, have compassion for him in bowels of mercy" (Charles). Of course it is not literal nakedness that is meant in the passage before us; in the case of men the Hebrew עָרוֹם (= **γυμνός**), while often used in a literal sense, is also frequently used in reference to one who was not wearing a כתנת (= **χιτών**) and thus appeared only in סְדִינִים, "under-garments," see Am. ii. 6; Isa. xx. 2 f.; Job xxii. 6, xxiv. 7-10. In the case of women, the reference is likewise to the כתנת, though in this case the garment was both longer and fuller than that of men; at the same time, it is improbable that the "sister" would have appeared without a veil, unless, indeed, we are dealing with a *venue* which is altogether more Western; this is a possibility which cannot be wholly excluded.—**λειπόμενοι**: must be taken with **ὑπάρχωσιν** as the addition of **ὦσιν** is poorly attested.—**ἐφημέρου τροφῆς**: "the food for the day"; the words express the dire necessity of those in want. *Cf.* Matt. vi. 11, **Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον**, and Nestle's note on **ἐπιούσιος** in Hastings' *D.C.G.*, ii. 58*a*. **ἐφήμερος** does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. or the Septuagint.

Ver. 16. **ὑπάγετε, θερμαίνεσθε, χορτάζεσθε**: these words do not seem to be spoken in irony; this is clear from the **τί τὸ ὄφελος.** They are spoken in all seriousness, and it is quite possible that those whom the writer is addressing were acting upon a mistaken application of Christ's words in Matt. vi. 25 ff., *Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. . . . Be not therefore anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.* It was entirely in accordance with their idea of **πίστις** that these people should leave to their Heavenly Father what, according to both Jewish and Christian teaching, it was *their* duty to do.—**μὴ δῶτε δὲ**: "The plural is often used after an indefinite singular" (Mayor).—**τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος**: only here in the N.T., but often found in classical writers; Mayor gives instances.—**τί τὸ ὄφελος**: in the earlier passage in which

εἰρήνῃ, θερμαίνεσθε καὶ χορτάζεσθε, μὴ δῶτε[1] δὲ αὐτοῖς[2] τὰ ἐπι- l—l 1 John iii, 17, 18.
τήδεια[3] τοῦ σώματος, τί τὸ[4] ὄφελος;[1] 17. οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις, m Rom. ix. 19.
ἐὰν μὴ ἔχῃ ἔργα,[5] νεκρά ἐστιν καθ' ἑαυτήν. 18. ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ [m] τις· n iii. 13.
[6]σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις,[7] κἀγὼ ἔργα ἔχω[6].[8] δεῖξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν σου [9] o Gal. v. 6; cf. Matt. vii. 16, 17.
χωρὶς[10] τῶν ἔργων,[11 12] κἀγώ σοι [n] δείξω[13] ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μου[14] τὴν p 1 Cor. viii. 6.
[o]πίστιν.[15 12] 19. [p]σὺ[16] πιστεύεις ὅτι[17] εἷς ἐστιν[18] ὁ Θεός.[17] καλῶς

[1] Dederit *ff*. [2] ei *s*. [3] Alimentum *ff*.
[4] Om. το BC[1], Arm., Tregmg, WH. [5] εργα εχη L, Arm., Thl., Oec.
[6—6] Tu operam habes ego fidem habeo *ff*. [7] εχεις; WH (altern. reading).
[8] εχω, Weiss; εχω. WH. [9] Om. 68, *ff*. [10] εκ KL, *m*., Thl., rec.
[11] Add σου CKL, *a*, Aeth., Thl., rec.
[12—12] Et ego tibi de operibus fidem *ff*.
[13] δειξω σοι ACKL, Syrr., Thl., Oec. Tregmg. [14] Om. Latt. (hab *s*), Syrhk.
[15] Add μου AKLP, *m* Vulg., Syrr., Copt., Aeth., Thl., Oec., rec. [16] Om. *s*.
[17—17] εις Θεος εστιν; B, 69, *a*, *c*, Thl., Tregmg, WH; εις ο Θεος εστιν; C Syrhk, Weiss, WH (altern. reading); ο Θεος εις εστιν K[2]L, Did., Oec.
[18] Om. *ff*.

this phrase occurs there is no question of irony, it is a direct fallacy which is being combated; in this verse, too, the writer is correcting a mistaken idea, this comes out clearly in the next verse.

Ver. 17. **οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις . . .**: just as faith without works is dead, so this spurious, quiescent charity, which is content to leave all to God without any attempt at individual effort, is worthless. —**καθ' ἑαυτήν**: the Vulgate *in semetipsa* brings out the force of this; such faith is, in its very essence, dead; *cf*. the Peshiṭtâ.

Ver. 18.—**ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις**: these words, together with the argumentative form of the verses that follow, imply that a well-known subject of controversy is being dealt with. **Ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις** is a regular argumentative phrase, used of an objection. "Instead of the future the optative with **ἄν** would be more common in classical Greek, but the latter form is rather avoided by the Hellenistic writers, occurring only eight times in the N.T.,—thrice in Luke, five times in Acts" (Mayor).—**ἔχεις**: the interrogative here suggested by WH does not commend itself, as the essence of the argument is the setting-up of two opposing and definite standpoints.—**κἀγὼ**: In the N.T. **καί** "often coalesces with **ἐγώ** (and its oblique cases), **ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖθεν, ἐκεῖνος,** and **ἄν**; but there are many exceptions, and especially where there is distinct co-ordination of **ἐγώ** with another pronoun or a substantive. There is much division of evidence" (WH, *The N.T. in Greek*, II. App., p. 145).—**δεῖξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν σου . . .**: **πίστις** is not used quite consistently by the writer; faith which requires works to prove its existence is not the same thing which is spoken of in the next verse as the possession of demons; the difference is graphically illustrated in the account of the Gadarene demoniac; in Luke viii. 28 the words, *What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God*, express a purely intellectual form of faith, which is a very different thing from the attitude of mind implied in the words which describe the whilom demoniac, as, *sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus* (ver. 35).—With the whole verse *cf*. Rom. iii. 28, iv. 6.

Ver. 19. **σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός**: *Cf*. Mark xii. 29, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6; Eph. iv. 6. The reading varies, see critical note above; the interrogative is unsuitable, see note on **ἔχεις** in the preceding verse. Somewhat striking is the fact that the regular and universally accepted formula (whether Hebrew or Greek) among the Jews is not adhered to; the Septuagint of Deut. vi. 4, which corresponds strictly to the original, runs: **Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν Κύριος εἷς ἐστιν,** and this is also the exact wording in Mark xii. 29, The stress laid on **Κύριος** (= יהוה) in the original is very pointed, the reason being the desire to emphasise the name of Jahwe as the God of *Israel* (note the omission of the article before **Κύριος**); it sounded a particularistic note. The elimination of **Κύριος** in the verse

q 1 Cor. x. 20.
r Matt. viii. 28, 29; Mk. v. 2—7; Luke iv. 33, 34; Acts xvi. 16, 17, xix. 15. Matt. v. 22.
s Judg. ix. 4 (Sept.); 1 Cor. xv. 36; *cf.* t Rom. iii. 28.

q ποιεῖς· καὶ τὰ q δαιμόνια r πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν. 20. θέλεις r γνῶναι, ὦ ἄνθρωπε s κενέ, ὅτι ἡ πίστις t χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων ἀργή [1]

[1] νεκρα ℵAC²KLP, Vulg., Pesh., Syr^hk, Copt., Arm., Aeth., Oec., rec.; vacua *ff*.

before us, and the emphatic position of **ὁ Θεός**,, is most likely intentional, and points to a universalistic tendency, such as is known to have been a distinctive characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism. To Jews of all kinds belief in the unity of God formed the basis of faith; this unity is expressed in what is called the *Shema'* (Deut. vi. 4 ff.), *i.e.*, "Hear," from the opening word of the passage referred to; strictly speaking, it includes Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21; Num. xv. 37-41, though originally it consisted of the one verse, Deut. vi. 4. From the time of the Exile, according to *Berachoth*, i. 1, the recitation of the *Shema'* every morning and evening became the solemn duty of all true Jews. To the present day it is the confession of faith which every Jew breathes upon his death-bed. It is said of Rabbi Akiba, who suffered the martyr's death, that he breathed out at the last the word "One" in reference to the belief in the Unity of God as contained in the *Shema'* (*Ber.*, 61*b*). A few instances may be given from Jewish literature in order to show the great importance of and honour attaching to the *Shema'*: "They cool the flames of Gehinnom for him who reads the *Shema'*" (*Ber.*, 15*b*); "Whoever reads the *Shema'* upon his couch is as one that defends himself with a two-edged sword" (*Meg.*, 3*a*); it is said in *Ber.*, i. § 2, that to him who goes on reading the *Shema'* after the prescribed time no harm will come; in *Suk.*, 42*a*, it is commanded that a father must teach his son to read the *Shema'* as soon as he begins to speak. The very parchment on which the *Shema'* is written is efficacious in keeping demons at a distance.—The single personality of God is frequently insisted upon in the O.T., Targums, and later Jewish literature; in the latter this fundamental article was sometimes believed to be impugned by Christian teaching concerning God, and we therefore find passages in which this latter is combated (see, on this, Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.*, p. 155); in the Targums all anthropomorphisms are avoided, since they were considered derogatory to the Divine Personality. We must suppose that it was owing to this intense jealousy wherewith the doctrine of the Unity of God was guarded that in the passage before us there are no qualifying words regarding the Godhead of Christ; when St. Paul (1 Cor. viii. 6) enunciates the same doctrine, **ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ**, he is careful to add, **καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός**. Such an addition might well have been expected in the verse before us; its omission must perhaps be accounted for owing to the very pronounced Judaistic character of the writer.—**καλῶς ποιεῖς**: it is impossible to believe that there is anything ironical about these words; as far as it went this belief was absolutely right; the context, which is sometimes interpreted as showing the irony of these words, only emphasises the inadequacy of the belief by itself.—**τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν**: one is, of course, reminded of the passage, Luke viii. 26 ff. (= Matt. viii. 28 ff.), already alluded to above: **δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς**, or, more graphically, in the parallel passage, **ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὧδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς**; *cf.* Acts xix. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 18. On demons see the writer's article in Hastings' *D.C.G.*. i. 438 ff.—Mayor gives some interesting reminiscences of these words in other early Christian writings, *e.g.*, Justin, *Trypho*, 49, etc.—**φρίσσουσιν**: **ἅπ. λέγ.** in the N.T.; literally "to bristle," *cf.* Job iv. 35; the very materialistic ideas concerning evil spirits which is so characteristic of Jewish Demonology would account for an expression which is not, strictly speaking, applicable to immaterial beings. One of the classes of demons comprised the שְׂעִירִים ("hairy ones"), in reference to these the word **φρίσσουσιν** would be extremely appropriate (see further, on Jewish beliefs concerning demons, the writer's articles in the *Expositor*, April, June, August, 1907).

Ver. 20. The words of this and the following verses, to the end of ver. 23, belong to the argument commenced by a supposed speaker—**ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις**—; it is all represented as being conducted by

ἐστιν; 21. Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ [u]θυσιαστήριον; 22. βλέπεις ὅτι ἡ πίστις [v]συνήργει [1] τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν

u Gen. xxii. 9-12.
v Heb. xi. 17.

[1] συνεργει א[1]A, Ti., Treg., communicat *ff*.

one man addressing another, the second person singular being used; with the ὁρᾶτε of ver. 24 the writer of the Epistle again speaks in his own name, and, as it were, sums up the previous argument. —Θέλεις δὲ γνῶναι: "Dost thou desire to know," *i.e.*, by an incontrovertible fact; the writer then, like a skilful disputant, altogether demolishes the position of his adversary by presenting something which was on all hands regarded as axiomatic. As remarked above, the question of Abraham's faith was a subject which was one of the commonplaces of theological discussion in the Rabbinical schools as well as among Hellenistic-Jews; this is represented as having been forgotten, or at all events, as not having been taken into account, so that the adversary, on being confronted with this fact, must confess that his argument is refuted by something that he himself accepts. It is this which gives the point to ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ. For κενέ the Peshiṭṭâ has חלישא "feeble," in its primary sense, but also "ignorant," which admirably expresses what the writer evidently intends. Both Mayor and Knowling speak of κενός as being equivalent to *Raca* (Matt. v. 22), but the two words are derived from different roots, the former from a Grk. root meaning "to be empty," the latter from a Hebr. one meaning "to spit" [see the writer's article in the *Expositor*, July, 1905, pp. 28 ff.]; κενός has nothing to do with *Raca*.—ἀργή: the reading νεκρά is strongly attested; the Corbey MS. makes a pun by reading "vacua," after having written "o homo vacue". Ἀργή is not so strong as νεκρά; *cf.* Matt. xii. 36, πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀργόν.

Ver. 21. Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν: A stereotyped phrase in Jewish literature.—οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη: the writer is referring to the well-known Jewish doctrine of זכות (*Zecûth*), on this subject see Introduction IV., § 2.—ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ . . .: on this subject an example of Jewish haggadic treatment may be of interest: "When Abraham finally held the knife over his beloved son, Isaac seemed doomed, and the angels of heaven shed tears which fell upon Isaac's eyes, causing him blindness in later life. But their prayer was heard. The Lord sent Michael the archangel to tell Abraham not to sacrifice his son, and the dew of life was poured on Isaac to revive him. The ram to be offered in his place had stood there ready, prepared from the beginning of Creation (*Aboth*, v. 6). Abraham had given proof that he served God not only from fear, but also out of love, and the promise was given that, whenever the *'Aḳedah* [= the "binding," *i.e.*, of Isaac] chapter was read on New Year's day, on which occasion the ram's horn is always blown, the descendants of Abraham should be redeemed from the power of Satan, of sin, and of oppression, owing to the merit of him whose ashes lay before God as though he had been sacrificed and consumed," *Pesiḳ. R.*, § 40 (quoted in *Jewish Encycl.*, i. 87*a*). It is interesting to notice that even in the Talmud (*e.g.*, *Ta'anit*, 4*a*) the attempted sacrifice of Isaac is regarded also from a very different point of view, such words as those of Jer. xix. 5; Mic. vi. 7, being explained as referring to this event (see further *Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Arch.*, xxiv. pp. 235 ff.).

Ver. 22. βλέπεις . . .: as these words are the deduction drawn from what precedes, it is better to take them in the form of a statement, and not as interrogative.—ἡ πίστις συνήργει: this implies a certain modification, with regard to πίστις, of the earlier position taken up by the writer, for in ver. 21 he says: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works?" no mention being made of faith; while here faith is accorded an equal place with works; *cf.* Gal. v. 6, πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, concerning which words Lightfoot says that they "bridge over the gulf which seems to separate the language of St. Paul and St. James. Both assert a principle of practical energy, as opposed to a barren, inactive theory". On συνήργει see *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Gad., iv. 7, "But the spirit of love worketh together with the law of God . . ." (Charles).—καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη: it is obvious that "faith" is used here in the highest sense, not merely as an attitude of mind,

ἔργων [w]ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη,[1] 23. καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ [x]γραφὴ ἡ
w *Cf.* 1 Thess. i. 3; John vi. 28, 29
λέγουσα· [y]ἐπίστευσεν δὲ[2] Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ,[3] καὶ ἐλογί-
x iv. 5, Gal. iii. 8; 1 Tim. v. 18;
σθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην,[y] καὶ [z]φίλος[4] Θεοῦ ἐκλήθη. 24.
1 Pet. ii. 6.

y–y Quoted from Gen. xv. 6; *cf.* 1 Macc. ii. 52; Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 6.
z 2 Chron. xx. 7; Isa. xli. 8; *cf.* Wisd. vii. 27.

[1] ετελειωθη; Treg.
[2] Om. δε L, latt. (hab *s*).
[3] Domino *ff*.
[4] δουλος 69.

but as a God-given possession. It must, however, be further remarked that if the Judaism of the Jewish-Christian writer of this part of the Epistle had been somewhat less strong, the words under consideration would probably have been put a little differently; for according to the purely Christian idea of faith, works, while being an indispensable proof of its existence, could not be said to perfect it, any more than the preaching of the faith could be said to perfect the preacher's belief; though works are the result and outcome of faith, they belong, nevertheless, to a different category.

Ver. 23. There is some little looseness in the way the O.T. is used in these verses; in ver. 21 mention is made of the *work* of offering up Isaac, whereby, it is said (ver. 22), faith is perfected; then it goes straight on (ver. 23) to say that the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, "Abraham believed . . ."; this reads as though the quotation were intended to refer to the offering up of Isaac,—the proof of perfected faith; but as a matter of fact the quotation refers to Abraham's belief in Jehovah's promise to the effect that the seed of Abraham was to be as numerous as the stars of heaven. In the O.T., that is to say, there is no connection between the quotation from Gen. xv. 6 and the offering-up of Isaac. This manipulation of Scripture is strongly characteristic of Jewish methods of exegesis.—**ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ . . .**: the N.T. = Septuagint, which differs from the Hebrew in reading **τῷ Θεῷ** instead of **τῷ κυρίῳ**,, and the passive **ἐλογίσθη** for the active. Faith, according to Jewish teaching, was a good deed which was bound to bring its reward; it was one of those things which *demanded* a reward; the phrase זכות אמונה ("the merit of faith, *i.e.*, "trustfulness") occurs in *Beresh. Rabba*, chap. 74, where it is parallel to זכות תורה ("the merit of [keeping] the Law"); merit, that is to say, is *acquired* by trusting God, just as merit is *acquired* by observing the precepts of the *Torah;* the man who has acquired sufficient merit is in a state of *Zecûth, i.e.*, in that state of righteousness, attained by good works, wherein he is in a position to *claim* his reward from God. Very pointed, in this connection, are the reiterated words of Christ in Matt. vi. 5, 16, "Verily, I say unto you, they have received their reward".—**φίλος θεοῦ**: *Cf.* 2 Chron. xx. 7; Isa. xli. 8; Dan. iii. 35 (Septuagint); in Sir. vi. 17 the Septuagint reads: **ὁ φοβούμενος Κύριον εὐθύνει φιλίαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι κατ' αὐτὸν οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλησίον αὐτοῦ**; the Hebrew has: "For as He Himself is, so is His friend, and as is His name, so are his works" ("works" must refer, most likely, to the "friend," not to God); the Syriac runs: "They that fear God show genuine friendship, for as He Himself is, so are His friends, and as is His name, so are His works". In the *Book of Jubilees*, xix. 9, it says in reference to Abraham: "For he was found faithful (believing), and was written down upon the heavenly tablets as the friend of God"; this is repeated in xxx. 20, but from what is said in the next verse it is clear that all those who keep the covenant can be inscribed as "friends" upon these tablets. Deissmann (*Bibelstudien*, pp. 159 f.) points out that at the court of the Ptolemies **φίλος** was the title of honour of the highest of the royal officials. In *Wisd.* vii. 27 the "friends of God" is an expression for the "righteous". The phrase **φίλος Θεοῦ**, therefore, while in the first instance probably general in its application, became restricted, so that finally, as among the Arabs, "the friend of God," *Khalîl Allah*, or simply *El Khalil*, became synonymous with Abraham. Irenæus, iv. 16, iv. 34, 4, refers to Abraham as "the friend of God," but he does not mention our Epistle; if a reference to this was intended it is the earliest trace of an acquaintance with it. See, further, an interesting note of Nestle's in the *Expository Times*, xv. pp. 46 f.; *cf.* Gen. xviii. 17 where the Septuagint

ὁρᾶτε ὅτι[1] ἐξ ἔργων [a]δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον.[2] 25. ὁμοίως[3] δὲ[4] καὶ [b][c]Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων [c]ἐδικαιώθη, [d]ὑποδεξαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους[5] καὶ ἑτέρᾳ[6] ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα[7] [b]; 26. ὥσπερ γὰρ[8] τὸ σῶμα [e]χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρόν ἐστιν, οὕτως καὶ[9] ἡ πίστις χωρὶς ἔργων[10] [f]νεκρά ἐστιν.

III. 1. Μὴ πολλοὶ [a]διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί μου, εἰδότες

a—a Heb. xi. 33.
b—b Josh. ii. 4, xv. 6, 17.
c 2 Macc. i. 10; Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 34; Heb. xi. 31.
d *Cf.* Luke x. 38, and see 1 Kgs. viii. 46.
e ii. 10.
f ii. 17.
a *Cf.* i. 19; Matt. xxiii. 8; Rom. ii. 20, 21; 1 Cor. xi. 31; 1 Tim. i. 7.

[1] τοινυν KL, Oec.
[2] μονον; Treg.
[3] ουτως C, Pesh., Copt., Arm., Aeth.
[4] Om. C, *ff*, Pesh., Copt., Arm.
[5] κατασκοπους CKmgL, Pesh., Arm., exploratores ex XII. tribus filiorum israhel *ff*.
[6] Pr. per *ff*, pr. ex *s*.
[7] Pr. eos *ff*.
[8] Om. B, Pesh., Arm., Aeth., WH (placed in mg.), autem *ff*, Orig.
[9] Om. *ff*.
[10] Pr. των ACKLP, Thl., Oec., Tregmg.

reads, **οὐ μὴ κρύψω ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ παιδός μου ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ**, which is quoted by Philo with **τοῦ φίλου μου** instead of **τοῦ π. μου**. In the MS., 69 **φίλος** in the verse before us is rendered **δοῦλος** (see critical note above).

Ver. 24. **ὁρᾶτε**: The argument between the two supposed disputants having been brought to a close, the writer addresses his hearers again, and sums up in his own words.—**μόνον**: the writer, by using this word, allows more importance to faith than he has yet done; there is not necessarily any inconsistency in this, the exigencies of argument on controversial topics sometimes require special stress to be laid on one point of view to the partial exclusion of another in order to balance the one-sided view of an opponent.

Ver. 25. **Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη**: It must probably have been the position already accorded to Rahab in Jewish tradition that induced the writer to cite an example like this. In *Mechilta*, 64*b*, it is said that the harlot Rahab asked for forgiveness of her sins from God, pleading on her own behalf the good works she had done in releasing the messengers. The attempts which have been made to explain away the force of **πόρνη** are futile.

Ver. 26. **πνεύματος**: Spitta's suggested reading, **κινήματος**, is very ingenious, but quite unnecessary; רוח is often used of "breath," and the Greek equivalent, **πνεῦμα**, is also used in the same way in the Septuagint.

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-18 form a self-contained section; the subject dealt with is the bridling of the tongue, see above vv. 19, 26, 27.

Ver. 1. **Μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε**: the Peshittâ reads: "Let there not be many teachers among you"; both the Greek version, which implies that the "teachers" belonged to the congregation of the faithful, as well as the Syriac, which implies that "teachers" from outside were welcomed,—*cf.* Pseud-Clem., *De Virginitate*, i. 11 . . . quod dicit Scriptura, "Ne multi inter vos sint doctores, fratres, neque omnes sitis prophetae . . ." (Resch., *op. cit.*, p. 186),—bear witness to what we know from other sources to have been the actual facts of the case. It is the greatest mistake to suppose that **διδάσκαλοι** here is equivalent to Rabbis in the technical sense. In the Jewish "Houses of Learning" (*i.e.*, the Synagogues, for these were not exclusively places of worship) whether in Palestine or in the Dispersion (but more so in the latter), there was very little restriction in the matter of teachers; almost anyone would be listened to who desired to be heard. We have an example of this in the case of our Lord Himself, who found no difficulty in entering into Synagogues and teaching (Matt. xii. 9 ff., xiii. 54; Mark i. 39; Luke vi. 14 ff., etc., etc.), although His presence there must have been very distasteful to the Jewish authorities, and although on some occasions the ordinary hearers altogether dissented from what He taught (*e.g.*, John vi. 59-66); the same is true of St. Peter, St. John, and above all of St. Paul. In the case of St. Paul (or his disciples) we have an extremely interesting instance (preserved in the Babylonian Talmud, *Meg.*, 26*a*) of an attempt, a successful attempt, made on one occasion to stop his teaching; it is said

b ii. 10. ὅτι μεῖζον κρίμα λημψόμεθα.[1] 2. πολλὰ γὰρ[2] πταίομεν [b]ἅπαντες·
c—c i. 19; Sir. xiv. 1, xix. 16, xxv. 8, xxxvi. 18. [c]εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει,[3] [d]οὗτος[4] [e]τέλειος ἀνήρ,[c] δυνατὸς[5] [f]χαλιν-
d Matt. xii. 37. αγωγῆσαι καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα. 3. εἰ δὲ[6] τῶν ἵππων τοὺς [g]χαλινοὺς
e i. 4.
f i. 26. g Ps. xxxii. 9; xxxix. 9.
εἰς τὰ στόματα[7] βάλλομεν εἰς[8] τὸ πείθεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν,[9] καὶ ὅλον

[1] ληψομεθα KLP, curss., sumitis Vulg. (accipiemus *ff*).
[2] Autem *ff*. [3] Non erat *ff*. [4] Add erit *ff*.
[5] δυναμενος א, curss., Cyr., Thl.; add τε Cvid.
[6] ειδε γαρ א (om. γαρ א[3]); ιδε CP, curss., Syr[hk], Arm., Sah., Thl.; הא גיר Pesh.
[7] το στομα A, curss., Pesh., Syr[hk], Arm.
[8] προς AKLP, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.
[9] ημιν αυτους AC, curss., Treg[mg]; om. ημιν *ff*.

that the Synagogue of the Alexandrians (mentioned in Acts vi. 9), which was called "the Synagogue of those of Tarsus," *i.e.*, the followers of St. Paul, was bought up by a Tannaite ("teacher") and used for private purposes (see Bergmann, *Jüdische Apologetik im neutestamentl. Zeitalter*, p. 9). Like the Athenians (Acts xvii. 21), many inquiring Jews were always ready to hear some new thing, and welcomed into their houses of learning teachers of all kinds (*cf.* Acts xv. 24; 1 Tim. i. 6, 7). The following would not have been said unless there had been great danger of Jews being influenced by the doctrines condemned: "All Israelites have their part in the world to come, . . . but the following (Israelites) have no part therein,—he who denies that the Resurrection is a doctrine the foundation of which is in the Bible, he who denies the divine origin of the *Torah*, and (he who is) an Epicurean" (*Sanh.*, xi. 1; quoted by Bergmann, *op. cit.*, p. 9). The custom of Jews, and especially of Hellenistic Jews, of permitting teachers of various kinds to enter their Synagogues and expound their views, was not likely to have been abrogated when they became Christians, which was in itself a sign of greater liberal-mindedness. The **διδάσκαλοι**, therefore, in the verse before us, must, it is held, be interpreted in the sense of what has been said. The whole passage is exceedingly interesting as throwing detailed light upon the methods of controversy in these Diaspora Synagogues; feeling seems to have run high, as was natural, mutual abuse was evidently poured forth without stint, judging from the stern words of rebuke which the writer has to use (ver. 6). On the **διδάσκαλοι** in the early Church see Harnack, *Expansion* . . . i. pp. 416-461.—**εἰδότες ὅτι μεῖζον κρίμα λημψόμεθα**: *Cf. Pirqe Aboth*, i. 18. "Whoso multiplies words occasions sin"; i. 12. "Abtalion said, Ye wise, be guarded in your words; perchance ye may incur the debt of exile, and be exiled to the place of evil waters; and the disciples that come after you may drink and die, and the Name of Heaven be profaned"; Taylor comments thus on these words: "Scholars must take heed to their doctrine, lest they pass over into the realm of heresy, and inoculate their disciples with deadly error. The penalty of untruth is untruth, to imbibe which is death". **λημψόμεθα**: the writer does not often associate himself with his hearers as he does here; the first person plural is only rarely found in the Epistle (*cf.* **πταίομεν** in the next verse).

Ver. 2. **πταίομεν**: see note above on this word ii. 10.—**εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει**: *Cf.* Sir. xix. 16, **τίς οὐχ ἥμαρτεν ἐν τῇ γλώσσῃ αὐτοῦ;**—**τέλειος**: see note on i. 4.—**ἀνήρ**: see note on i. 12.—**χαλιναγωγῆσαι**: see note on i. 26.—**καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα**: it is quite possible that these words are meant literally; the exaggerated gesticulation of an Oriental in the excitement of debate is proverbial; that the reference here is to even more than this is also quite within the bounds of possibility, *cf.* John xviii. 22; Acts xxiii. 2, 3.

Ver. 3. **εἰ δὲ**: this is the best attested reading, but see Mayor's admirable note in favour of the reading **ἴδε γάρ**.—**τῶν ἵππων**: "The genitive is here put in an emphatic place to mark the comparison. It belongs both to **χαλινούς** and to **στόματα**, probably more to the former as distinguishing it from the human bridle, so we have **ἄχρι τῶν χαλινῶν τῶν ἵππων**, Apoc. xiv. 20, **ἐπὶ**

τὸ σῶμα αὐτῶν μετάγομεν.[1] 4. ἰδοὺ[2] καὶ τὰ πλοῖα, τηλικαῦτα[3] ὄντα καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων σκληρῶν[4] ἐλαυνόμενα, μετάγεται ὑπὸ ἐλαχίστου [h]πηδαλίου [5]ὅπου[6] ἡ [1]ὁρμὴ[7] τοῦ εὐθύνοντος βούλεται[8 5]. 5. οὕτως[9] καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα μικρὸν μέλος ἐστὶν καὶ[10] μεγάλα [k]αὐχεῖ.[10] ἰδοὺ ἡλίκον[11] πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει· 6. καὶ[12] ἡ γλῶσσα[13] [1]πῦρ,[14] ὁ

h Acts xxvii. 40. i Acts xiv. 5. k Ps. xii. 3, 4; lxxiii. 8, 9; Sir. xxviii. 10. l *Cf.* i. 26; Prov. xvi. 27; Sir. viii. 8; *cf.* Prov. xii. 18, xv. 1, 2.

[1] μεταγομεν αυτων A, 13. [2] ειδε 24. [3] Pr. τα B.
[4] Pr. tam *ff*; σκληρων ανεμων AL, curss.
[5—5] Et ubicumque diriguntur volumptate eorum qui eas gubernant *ff*.
[6] Add αν ACKLP, curss., Thl., Oec., Tregmg, rec.
[7] Om. η ορμη s. [8] βουληται ACKP; βουληθη 13.
[9] ωσαυτως A, 5. [10—10] μεγαλαυχει ℵC²KL, curss., Thl., Oec.
[11] ολιγον A¹C²KL, curss., Syrr., Sah., Copt., Arm., Aeth., pusillum *ff*.
[12] Om. ℵ¹. [13] Ti. punctuates thus: αναπτει η γλωσσα,.
[14] Weiss punctuates: πυρ.

τὸν χαλινὸν τοῦ ἵππου, Zech. xiv. 20. *Cf.* Ps. xxxii. 9" (Mayor). Knowling draws attention to Philo who "speaks of the easy way in which the horse, the most spirited of animals, is led when bridled, *De Mundi Opif.*, p. 19E".—**καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα . . .**: *Cf.* what was said in the preceding verse.

Ver. 4. **τηλικαῦτα**: *Cf.* 2 Cor. i. 10; Heb. ii. 3; Rev. xvi. 18, the only other N.T. passages in which the word occurs.—**πηδαλίου**: only elsewhere in N.T. in Acts xxvii. 40.—**ὁρμή**: only elsewhere in the N.T. in Acts xiv. 5, used there, however, in the sense of a rush of people. The graphic picture in this verse gives the impression that the writer gives the result of personal observation.

Ver. 5. **ἡ γλῶσσα . . .**; For this idea of the independent action of a member of the body taken as though personality were attached to it see Matt. v. 29, 30, xv. 19; it is quite in the Hebrew style, *cf.* in the O.T. the same thing in connection with anthropomorphic expressions. Moffatt (*Expository Times*, xiv. p. 568) draws attention to Plutarch's essay, *De Garrulitate*, 10, where the union of similar nautical and igneous metaphors (as in Jas. iii. 4-6) is found; "the moralist speaks first of speech as beyond control once it is uttered, like a ship which has broken loose from its anchorage. But in the following sentence, he comes nearer to the idea of James by quoting from a fragment of Euripides these lines :—

Μικροῦ γὰρ ἐκ λαμπτῆρος Ἰδαῖον λέπας
Πρήσειεν ἄν τις· καὶ πρὸς ἄνδρ' εἰπὼν ἕνα,
Πύθοιντ' ἂν ἀστοὶ πάντες."—

καὶ μεγάλα αὐχεῖ: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T.; the same would apply to the alternative reading (see critical note above) **μεγαλαυχεῖ**. In Sir. xlviii, 18 we have, **καὶ ἐμεγαλαύχησεν ὑπερηφανίᾳ αὐτοῦ**. Mayor most truly remarks: "There is no idea of vain boasting, the whole argument turns upon the reality of the power which the tongue possesses"; this fully bears out what has been implied above, that this section has for its object the attempt to pacify the bitterness which had arisen in certain Synagogues of the Diaspora owing to controversies aroused by the harangues of various "teachers".—**ἰδοὺ ἡλίκον πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει**: at the risk of being charged with fancifulness the surmise may be permitted as to whether this picture was not suggested by the sight of an excited audience in some place of meeting; when an Eastern audience has been aroused to a high pitch, the noise of tongues, and gesticulation of the arms occasioned by the discussion following upon the oration which has been delivered, might most aptly be compared to a forest fire; the tongue of one speaker has set ablaze all the inflammable material which controversy brings into being. The possibility that the writer had something of this kind in his mind should not be altogether excluded.—**ἀνάπτει** occurs in the N.T. elsewhere only in Luke xii. 49; Taylor (quoted by Mayor) says: "On fires kindled by the tongue see Midr. Rabb. on Lev. (xiv. 2) xvi. where the words are almost the same as those in St. James, *quanta incendia lingua excitat!*"

Ver. 6. See critical note above for suggested differences in punctuation.—

m Matt. xv. 11, 18, 19; *cf.* xii. 36, 37; Jude 23.
n Ps. lxxvii. 18 (Heb.); Eccles. xii. 6.

[1] Add **ουτως** P, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.; add **ουτως και** L, 106. [2] **και** ℵ[1], Ti.

καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ: this metaphor was familiar to Jews, see Prov. xvi. 27, . . . *And in his lips there is as a scorching fire;* the whole of the passage Sir. xxviii. 8-12 is very *à propos*, especially ver. 11, **ἔρις κατασπευδομένη ἐκκαίει πῦρ, καὶ μάχη κατασπεύδουσα ἐκχέει αἷμα.** Knowling refers to *Psalms of Sol.* xii. 2-4, where the same metaphor is graphically presented, but the reference is to slander, not to the fire engendered by public controversy; ver. 2 runs: "Very apt are the words of the tongue of a malicious man, like fire in a threshing-floor that burns up the straw" (the text in the second half of the verse is corrupt, but the general meaning is clear enough).—**καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας . . . τῆς γεέννης**: Carr has a very helpful note on this difficult verse, he says: "a consideration of the structure of the sentence, the poetical form in which the thoughts are cast, also throws light on the meaning. From this it appears that the first thought is resumed and expounded in the last two lines, while the centre doublet contains a parallelism in itself. The effect is that of an underground flame concealed for a while, then breaking out afresh. Thus **φλογίζουσα** and **φλογιζομένη** refer to **πῦρ**, and **σπιλοῦσα** to **κόσμος**, though grammatically these participles are in agreement with **γλῶσσα**."—**ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας**: This expression is an extremely difficult one, and a large variety of interpretations have been suggested; the real *crux* is, of course, the meaning of **κόσμος**. In this Epistle **κόσμος** is always used in a bad sense, i. 27, ii. 5, iv. 4. In the Septuagint **ὁ κόσμος** is several times the rendering of the Hebrew צְבָא, "host" (of heaven, *i.e.*, the stars, etc.), see Gen. ii. 1; Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3; there is no Hebrew word which corresponds to **κόσμος**, properly speaking; and it would therefore be no matter of surprise if a Jew with a knowledge of Hebrew should use **κόσμος** in a loose sense. In the N.T. **αἰών** is often used in the same sense as **κόσμος**, *e.g.*, Matt. xii. 32; Mark iv. 19; Eph. i. 21, of this world; here again it is mostly in an evil sense in which it is referred to, whether as **αἰών** or **κόσμος**. It is, therefore, possible that **κόσμος** might be used in the sense of **αἰών**, by a Jew, but as referring to a sphere not on this earth. Schegg (quoted by Mayor) interprets the phrase, "the sphere or domain of iniquity," and though this is not the natural meaning of **κόσμος**, this cannot be urged as an insuperable objection to his interpretation; we are dealing with the work of an Oriental, and a Jew, in an age long ago, and we must not therefore look for strict accuracy. If **κόσμος** may be regarded as being used in the sense of **αἰών**, which is applicable to this world or to the world to come, then Schegg's "domain of iniquity" might refer to a sphere in the next world. When it is further noticed that the tongue is called "fire," and that this fire has been kindled by **ἡ γέεννα**, the place of burning, it becomes possible to regard the words **ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας** as a symbolic expression of Gehenna (see further below, under **τῆς γεέννης**).—**καθίσταται**: "is set," *i.e.*, "is constituted". Mayor says: "It is opposed to **ὑπάρχω**, because it implies a sort of adaptation or development as contrasted with the natural or original state; to **γίγνομαι**, because it implies something of fixity".—**ἡ σπιλοῦσα**: **σπίλος** means a "stain," *cf.* Jude 23.—**φλογίζουσα**; **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T., *cf.* Wisd. iii. 28.—**τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως**. "the wheel of nature," *i.e.*, the whole circle of innate passions; the meaning is that this wrong use of the tongue engenders jealousy, and faction, and every vile deed, *cf.* ver. 16. For the different interpretations of the phrase see Mayor.—**φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης**: In Jewish theology two ideas regarding the fate of the wicked hereafter existed, at one time, concurrently; according to the one, Hades (*Sheol*) was the place to which the spirits of all men, good as well as bad, went after death; at the resurrection, the good men arose and dwelt in glory, while the wicked remained in Sheol. According to a more developed belief, the place of the departed was not the same for the good and the bad; the former went to a place of rest, and awaited the final resurrection, while the latter went to a place of torment; after the

σεως[1] καὶ [o]φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς [p]γεέννης. 7. πᾶσα γὰρ[2] φύσις θηρίων τε καὶ πετεινῶν ἑρπετῶν τε[3] καὶ ἐναλίων δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται[4] τῇ φύσει[5] τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ, 8. τὴν δὲ[6] γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς[7] δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων[7]· ἀκατάστατον[8] κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ [q]θανατηφόρου. 9. ἐν αὐτῇ εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν Κύριον[9] καὶ πατέρα, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ καταρώμεθα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς [r]καθ' ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ[r]

o Luke xvi 24.
p Matt. v. 22.
q Ps. cxl. 3; Eccles. x. 11; *cf.* Sir. xxviii. 17-23.
r—r Quoted from Gen. i. 27.

[1] Add ημων א, 7, 25, 68, Vulg., Pesh., Aeth.; γεεννης Thl., Oec. [2] Autem *ff*.
[3] Om. A, curss., Arm. [4] Om. και δεδαμασται, Pesh.
[5] Add autem *ff*. [6] Om. *ff*.
[7] δυναται δαμ. ανθρ. אAKP, 69, 133, *a*, *c*, Tregmg, Ti.; δυν. ανθρ. δαμ. L, curss., Arm., Copt., Thl., Oec.
[8] ακατασχετον CKL, curss., Pesh., Cyr., Dam., Thl., Oec., rec.
[9] Θεον KL, curss., Vulg., Syrhk, Epiph., Thl., Oec.

resurrection the good enter into eternal bliss, the wicked into eternal woe, but whether these latter continue in the same place in which they had hitherto been, or whether it is a different place of torment, is not clear. A realistic conception of the place of torment arose when the "Valley of Hinnom" (גי־הנם = ἡ γέεννα), was pointed out as the place in which the spirits of the wicked suffered; but very soon this conception became spiritualised, and there arose the belief that the Valley of Hinnom was only the *type* of what actually existed in the next world. The fire which burned in the Valley of Hinnom was likewise transferred to the next world; hence the phrases: **γέεννα τοῦ πυρός, κάμινος τοῦ πυρός,** etc. *Cf.* iv. Esdr. vii. 36; Rev. ix. 1, etc.

Vv. 7, 8. These verses, are, of course, not to be taken literally; their exaggerative character rather reminds one of the orator carried away by his subject. But it must be remembered that to the Oriental the language of exaggeration is quite normal. Moreover, this enumeration of various classes of animals was familiar from the O.T., and would be uttered as stereotyped phrases often are, it being well understood that the words are not to be taken *au pied de la lettre*; *e.g.*, a very familiar passage from the *Torah* runs: **καὶ ὁ τρόμος ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ φόβος ἔσται ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ὄρνεα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ κινούμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης** (Gen. ix. 2); and one who shows so much familiarity with the Wisdom literature would be well acquainted with what tradition had imputed to Solomon: **ἐλάλησε περὶ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἑρπετῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἰχθύων** (1 Kings iv. 33), *cf.* Gen. i. 26 (i. 27 is quoted in the next verse); Deut. iv. 17, 18; Acts x. 12.

Ver. 9. **ἐν αὐτῇ**: this is Hebrew usage, *cf.* **εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ,** Luke xxii. 49; **ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ,** Rev. vi. 8.—**εὐλογοῦμεν**: this use is Hellenistic. Both in speaking and writing the Jews always added the words ברוך הוא ("Blessed [be] He") after the name of God; *cf.* Mark xiv. 61, where **ὁ εὐλογητός** is used in reference to God. —**τὸν Κύριον καὶ πατέρα**: the reading **Κύριον** can scarcely be right; **Θεόν** is not, it is true, well attested (see critical note), but it is required on account of the **καθ' ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ**; neither the combination **τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα** nor **τὸν Κύριον καὶ πατέρα** is in accordance with ordinary Jewish usage; the exact phrase does not occur in the Bible elsewhere, the nearest approach being Tobit xiii. 4, . . . **καὶ Θεὸς αὐτὸς πατὴρ ἡμῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.** *Cf.* Isa. lxiii. 16, **σὺ Κύριε πατὴρ ἡμῶν,** and 1 Chron. xxix. 10, **εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, ὁ Πατὴρ ἡμῶν.** Although the Jews frequently speak of God as "Father," it is usually in a different combination, probably the most usual being "Our Father" alone, or "Our Father and King"; in the great prayer called the "Shemôneh 'Esreh" ("Eighteen"[Nineteen] Blessings), which was formulated in its final form about the year 110 A.D., each of the forty-four petitions which it contains begins with the words: *Abinu Malkênu** ("Our Father, our King").

* To be distinguished from the "Abinu Malkênu" prayer used in the penitential portion of the Jewish Liturgy.

γεγονότας· 10. [s]ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα.[s] οὐ χρή, ἀδελφοί μου, ταῦτα οὕτως γενέσθαι. 11. μήτι ἡ πηγὴ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς [t]ὀπῆς βρύει τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρόν; 12. μὴ δύναται, ἀδελφοί μου, συκῆ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι ἢ ἄμπελος σῦκα; [1]οὔτε ἁλυκὸν γλυκὺ[1] ποιῆσαι ὕδωρ.

13. Τίς[2] [u]σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν; [v]δειξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς

s—s *Cf.* Sir. xxviii. 12.
t Heb. xi. 38.
u Gal. vi. 4.
v ii. 18.

[1]—[1] ουτως ουτε αλυκον γλυκυ C^2, latt., Pesh.; ουτως ουδεμια πηγη αλυκον και γλυκυ KL, curss., Th1., Oec., rec.

[2] Om. K, curss.; pr. ει 7, curss.

Πατήρ is always used in reference to God in order to emphasise the divine love; and in the passage before us a contrast is undoubtedly implied between the love of the Father towards all His children, and the mutual hatred among these latter.—**καταρώμεθα**: this word shows that the special sin of the tongue which is here referred to is not slander or backbiting or lying, but personal abuse, such as results from loss of temper in heated controversy. *Cf.* Rom. xii. 13, **εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε**, and see the very appropriate passage in the *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Benj. vi. 5, **ἡ ἀγαθὴ διάνοια οὐκ ἔχει δύο γλώσσας εὐλογίας καὶ κατάρας.**—**τοὺς καθ' ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ γεγονότας**: quoted, apparently from memory, from Gen. i. 26, where the Septuagint reads, **κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν**; the Hebrew דמות (**ὁμοίωσις**) is synonymous with צלם (**εἰκών**). The belief that men are made in the material likeness of God is taught both in Biblical and post-Biblical Jewish literature; philosophers like Philo would naturally seek to modify this. An interesting passage which reminds one of this verse is quoted by Knowling from *Bereshith*, R. xxiv., Rabbi Akiba (born in the middle of the first century A.D.), in commenting on Gen. ix. 6, said: "Whoso sheddeth blood, it is reckoned to him as if he diminished *the likeness*"; then referring presently to Lev. xix. 18 (*Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*), he continues, "Do not say: 'after that I am despised, let my neighbour also be despised'. R. Tanchuma said, 'If you do so, understand that you despise him of whom it was written, *in the likeness of God made He him*'." The lesson is that he who curses him who was made in the image of God implicitly curses the prototype as well

Ver. 10. **ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος**: This incongruity is often rebuked in Jewish literature; it was the more needed because in earlier days it was not regarded as reprehensible, *cf.* Prov. xi. 26, xxiv. 24, xxvi. 2, xxx. 10, etc.—**εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα**: this does not imply a combination of blessing and cursing, as though such a combination were condemned, while either by itself were allowable (Mayor); it simply means that the mouth which blesses God when uttering prayer, curses men at some other times, *e.g.*, during embittered controversy.—**οὐ χρή**: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T.

Ver. 11. **μήτι ἡ πηγὴ . . . τὸ πικρόν**: these words show that the writer is thinking of the real source whence both good and evil words come; *cf.* Matt. xii. 34, 35: *Ye offspring of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh . . .*; *cf.* **ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν** below; **βρύει** does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. or the Septuagint; and **ὀπή** is only found elsewhere in the N.T. in Heb. xi. 38, *cf.* Exod. xxxiii. 22; **πικρόν** is only used here and in ver. 14 in the N.T.; *cf.* Sir. iv. 6, **. . . καταρωμένου γάρ σε ἐν πικρίᾳ ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ.**

Ver. 12. With the whole verse *cf.* Matt. vii. 16, 17; for the use of **ποιεῖν** see Matt. iii. 10, **πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπόν . . .**; **ἁλυκόν** does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. or Septuagint, though in Num. iii. 12, Deut. iii. 17, etc., we have the phrase **ἡ θάλασσα ἡ ἁλυκή** = the Dead Sea. "There is great harshness in the construction **μὴ δύναται ποιῆσαι; οὔτε ποιῆσαι.** If the government of **δύναται** is continued, we ought to have **ἤ** for **οὔτε** followed by a question; otherwise we should have expected an entirely independent clause, reading **ποιήσει** for **ποιῆσαι**" (Mayor).

Ver. 13. **Τίς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν**: The writer's appeal

[w] ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν [x] πραΰτητι σοφίας. 14. [y] εἰ δὲ [1] [z] ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ [a] ἐριθείαν [2] ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ [3] ὑμῶν,[y] μὴ κατα-
καυχᾶσθε [4] [5] καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας.[5] 15. οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη
ἡ σοφία [b] ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη, ἀλλὰ [6] [c] ἐπίγειος, [d] ψυχική, δαιμονι-
ώδης· 16. ὅπου γὰρ [7] [e] ζῆλος καὶ [f] ἐριθεία,[8] ἐκεῖ [9] [g] ἀκαταστασία

w Gal. i. 13 *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 12. x i. 21. y—y iii. 16; Eph. iv. 31; Rom. xiii. 13; Acts v. 17. z 1 Cor. iii. 3.

a Gal. v. 20. b i. 17, iii. 17. c *Cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7. d 1 Cor. ii. 14. e Acts v. 13; Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 3. f Gal. v. 20. g 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

[1] Add αρα AP, curss. [2] ερειθιαν B[1]; ερειθειαν A, εριθιαν 13, 101, WH.
[3] ταις καρδιαις ℵ, curss., Latt., Syrr., Copt., Arm. [4] καυχασθε A, curss.
[5—5] της αγηθ. και ψευδ. ℵ[1], Ti.; κατα της αληθ. και ψευδ. ℵ[3], Pesh.
[6] αλλ ACKLP. [7] Autem *ff*.
[8] εριθεια B[1]; ερειθεια B[2]; εριθια 13, 101, WH; ερεις C; ερις P.
[9] + και ℵA, curss., Weiss.

to the self-respect of his hearers. **σοφός** and **ἐπιστήμων** (the latter does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.) are connected in Deut. i. 13, where in reference to judges it is said, **δότε αὐτοῖς ἄνδρας σοφοὺς καὶ ἐπιστήμονας καὶ συνετούς**, *cf.* Deut. iv. 6; Isa. v. 21.—**ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς**: *Cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 12. **ἀναστροφή** is literally a "turning back," but later connotes "manner of life". *Cf.* a quotation from an inscription from Pergamos (belonging to the second century B.C.) given by Deissmann, in which it is said concerning one of the royal officials: **ἐν πᾶσιν κα[ιροῖς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ἀδ]εῶς ἀναστρεφόμενος** (*op. cit.*, p. 83).—**ἐν πραΰτητι σοφίας**: *cf.* with the whole of this verse Sir. iii. 17, 18, **Τέκνον, ἐν πραΰτητι τὰ ἔργα σου διέξαγε, καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου δεκτοῦ ἀγαπηθήσῃ. Ὅσῳ μέγας εἶ, τοσούτῳ ταπείνου σεαυτόν, καὶ ἔναντι Κυρίου εὑρήσεις χάριν.** The pride of knowledge is always a subtle evil, *cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 1.

Ver. 14. **εἰ δὲ ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ ἐριθείαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν**: This makes it quite clear that what has been referred to all along is controversial strife; the bitter use of the tongue which the writer has been reprobating is the personal abuse which had been heaped upon one another by the partisans of rival schools of thought. **ζῆλον** is mostly used in a bad sense in the N.T., though the opposite is sometimes the case (*e.g.*, 2 Cor. xi. 2; Gal. i. 14); the intensity of feeling which had been aroused among those to whom the Epistle was addressed is seen by the words **ζῆλον πικρόν**, with the latter word in an emphatic position; they form a striking contrast to **πραΰτητι σοφίας**. The word **ἐριθείαν**, derived from **ἔριθος** "a hireling," means "party-spirit".—**μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε**: the malicious triumphing at the least point of vantage gained by one party was just the thing calculated to embitter the other side; this was a real "lying against the truth," because such petty triumphs are often gained at the expense of truth.

Ver. 15. **οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη**: The wisdom referred to,—acute argumentl subtle distinctions, clever controversia, methods which took small account of truth so long as a temporary point was gained, skilful dialectics, bitter sarcasms, the more enjoyed and triumphed in if the poisonous shaft came home and rankled in the breast of the opponent,—in short, all those tricks of the unscrupulous controversialist which are none the less contemptible for being clever,—this was wisdom of a certain kind; but, as expressed by the writer of the Epistle with such extraordinary accuracy, it was earthly (**ἐπίγειος**) as opposed to the wisdom which came down from above, it was human (**ψυχική**, *i.e.*, the domain wherein all that is essentially human holds sway) in that it pandered to self-esteem, and it was demoniacal (**δαιμονιώδης**) in that it raised up the "very devil" in the hearts of both opposer and opposed. Nowhere is the keen knowledge of human nature, which is so characteristic of the writer, more strikingly displayed than in these vv. 15, 16.

Ver. 16. **πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα**: this sums up the matter; *cf.* John iii. 20, **πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς**, and with this one might compare again the words in our Epistle, i. 17, **πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ . . . ἄνωθέν ἐστιν καταβαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων.**

καὶ πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα. 17. ἡ δὲ [h] ἄνωθεν[1] [i] σοφία πρῶτον μὲν [k] ἁγνή ἐστιν, ἔπειτα [l] εἰρηνική, [m] ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής,[2] μεστὴ [n] ἐλέους, καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, [o] ἀδιάκριτος, [p] ἀνυπόκριτος.[3] 18. [q] καρπὸς[4] δὲ δικαιοσύνης[5] ἐν [r] εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην.

IV. 1. ΠΟΘΕΝ[6] [a] πόλεμοι καὶ πόθεν[7] μάχαι ἐν ὑμῖν; οὐκ ἐντεῦ-

h i. 17. i 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7. k *Cf.* iv. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 11; Phil. v. 8; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 2; 1 Jn. iii. 3. l Heb. xii. 11. m Phil. iv. 5. n Gal. v. 22; *cf.* Luke vi. 36. o ii. 4; *cf.* 2 Cor. v. 16. p Rom. xii. 9. q Is. xxxii. 17; Am. vi. 12; Gal. vi. 8; Phil. i. 11; Heb. xii. 11. r Matt. v. 9. a 2 Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 9.

[1] Dei *ff*. [2] + Bonis consentiens Vulg. (om. Vulg^{A}).
[3] Pr. και KL, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.; pr. inreprehensibilis *ff*.
[4] Pr. ο ℵ. [5] Pr. της K, Oec. [6] Pr. et *s*.
[7] Om. KL, curss., Vulg., rec.

Ver. 17. **ἡ δὲ ἄνωθεν σοφία**: the divine character of wisdom is beautifully expressed in Wisd. vii. 25, **ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως, καὶ ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής.**—**ἁγνή**: in Wisd. ix. 10, the prayer is uttered that God would send forth wisdom "out of the holy heavens . . ."; of that which is thus *holy* the first characteristic would be purity, the two ideas are inseparable; it is also possible that in the mind of the writer there was the thought of the contrast between purity and the sin which he knew some of his hearers to be guilty of (see above, the notes on i. 12 ff., iv. 3, 4).—**εἰρηνική**; only elsewhere in the N.T. in Heb. xii. 11; *cf.* Prov. iii. 17, where it is said of wisdom that "all her paths are peace". The word is evidently chosen to emphasise the *strife* referred to in an earlier verse.—**ἐπιεικής**: the word is meant as a contrast to unfair, unreasonable argument, *cf. Pss. of Sol.* v. 14.—**εὐπειθής**: this word, again, implies a contrast to the unbending attitude of self-centred controversialists; it does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.—**μεστὴ ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν**: the exact reverse of the cursing and bitterness of which some had already been convicted; in Wisd. vii. 22, 23, wisdom is spoken of as having a spirit which is: **φιλάγαθον . . . φιλάνθρωπον.**—**ἀδιάκριτος**: *Cf.* **διακρίνομαι** above (i. 6, ii. 4) which, as Mayor points out, makes it probable that we must understand the adjective here in the sense of "single-minded"; perhaps one might say that here it means almost "generous," in contrast to the unfair imputations which might be made in acrimonious discussion; the word occurs here only in the N.T.—**ἀνυπόκριτος**: *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 22; "genuine," as contrasted with the spurious "earthly" wisdom.

Ver. 18. The keynote of this verse is *peace*, as contrasted with the jealousy, faction and confusion mentioned above; peace and righteousness belong together, they are the result of true wisdom, the wisdom that is from above; on the other hand, strife and "every vile deed" belong together, and they are the result of the wisdom that is "earthly, **ψυχική**, demoniacal".

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1 ff. These verses reveal an appalling state of moral depravity in these *Diaspora* congregations; strife, self-indulgence, lust, murder, covetousness, adultery, envy, pride and slander are rife; the conception of the nature of prayer seems to have been altogether wrong among these people, and they appear to be given over wholly to a life of pleasure. It must have been terrible for the writer to contemplate such a sink of iniquity. On the assumption, therefore, of unity of authorship for this Epistle, it is absolutely incomprehensible how, in view of such an awful state of affairs, the writer could commence his Epistle with the words: "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations". It is held by some that the writer is, in part, using figurative language; thus, Mayor and Knowling do not think that the adultery referred to is meant literally; but in view of the mention of the "pleasures that war in your members," and of the injunctions "Cleanse your hands," "Purify your hearts," it is difficult to believe that the writer is speaking figuratively. Is one to regard the words in ii. 11 ("For he that saith, Do not commit adultery, said also Do not kill . . .") as figurative also? And i. 14, 15? *Cf.* Acts xv. 20, 29. Moreover, it is one of

θεν, ἐκ τῶν [b]ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν [c]τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν[c]; 2. ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε[1]· [d]φονεύετε[2] καὶ [c]ζηλοῦτε, καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν· μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμεῖτε. οὐκ ἔχετε[3] διὰ τὸ μὴ

b iv. 3; Luke viii. 14; 2 Pet. ii. 13.
c—c Rom. vii. 23; 1 Pet. ii. 11;
cf. Rom. vi. 13. d v. 6. e 1 Cor. xii. 31.

[1] Habebitis *ff*. [2] φονευετε. και WH (altern. reading); φθονειτε και Erasmus.
[3] και ουκ εχ. אP, curss., Latt., Syrr., Arm., Aeth., Thl., Oec., Ti.; add δε rec.
[From here to end of Ep. C is wanting.]

the characteristics of the writer that he speaks straight to the point. It is true that in the O.T. adultery is sometimes used in a figurative sense, meaning unfaithfulness to Jahwe; but it is well to remember that such a use is quite exceptional; out of the thirty-one passages in which adultery is spoken of, in only five is a figurative sense found. In the N.T. there are only two possible cases of a figurative use apart from the verse before us (Matt. xii. 39 = xvi. 4, Mark viii. 38). The word "to commit fornication" (זנה) occurs oftener, in the O.T., in a figurative sense; but in comparison with the vastly larger instances of a literal sense, the former must be regarded as exceptional. But even granting that this particular word is figuratively used, there is still a terrible list of other sins, the meaning of which cannot be explained away; these are more than sufficient to bear witness to the truly awful moral condition of those to whom the Epistle is addressed. On the assumption of an early date for our Epistle, the low state of morals here depicted is extremely difficult to account for. In a community which had recently received and accepted the new faith, with its very high ideals, one would naturally look for some signs of new-born zeal, some conception of the meaning of Christianity, some reflex of the example of the Founder; religious strife, owing to a mistaken zeal, one can understand; isolated cases of moral delinquency are almost to be expected; but the collective wickedness of a new-born Christian community,—this would be quite incomprehensible; and it is clear from the verses before us that the writer is not singling out exceptions. In a second or third generation the community living among heathen surroundings might conceivably become so contaminated as to have lost its genuinely Christian character; with the lapse of years there is an inevitable tendency to deteriorate, until a new spirit of discipline is infused. It seems more in accordance with known facts, and with commonsense, to regard the people to whom this Epistle (or part of it) was addressed as those who had deteriorated from the high ideal set by their fathers and grandfathers, and to see in the writer one who sought to inspire a new sense of discipline and morals into the hearts of his Jewish-Christian brethren. — Vv. 1-10 form a self-contained whole, dealing with the general state of moral depravity in the community (presumably the writer has more particularly one community in view), and ending with a call to repentance. Vv. 11, 12 form another independent section, belonging in substance to ii. 1-13. Vv. 13-17 form again a separate section without any reference to what precedes or follows.

Ver. 1. **πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι**: the former refers to the permanent state of enmity, which every now and then breaks out into the latter; like war and battles. — **ἐν ὑμῖν**: comprehensive. — **ἐντεῦθεν**: lays special stress on the place of origin, which is seen in the following words: **ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν**: **ἡδοναί** is sometimes used of the lusts of the flesh, *e.g.*, in the *Letter of Aristeas* (Swete, *Intro. to O.T. in Greek*, p. 567), in answer to the question: "Why do not the majority of men take possession of virtue"? it is said: "**Ὅτι φυσικῶς ἅπαντες ἀκρατεῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς τρεπόμενοι γεγόνασιν.** *Cf.* 4 Macc. vi. 35; Luke viii. 14; Tit. iii. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 13. — **τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν**: the same thought is found in 1 Pet. ii. 11, **παρακαλῶ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς**, *cf.* Rom. vii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 7.

Vv. 2, 3. **ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε . . .**: It must be confessed that these verses are very difficult to understand; we have, on the one hand, lusting and coveting, murdering and fighting; and, on the other hand, praying. Murdering and fighting are the means used in order to obtain that which is coveted; yet in the same breath it is said that the reason why the coveted things are not

f Prov. i. 28.
g Rom. viii. 26; *cf.* 1 Jn. v. 14.
h Matt. vii. 7.
i Matt. xii. 39.
k Matt. vi. 24; Luke vi. 26; 1 Jn. ii. 15.
l Rom. viii. 7; Eph. ii. 15.
m—m Jn. xv. 19: xvii. 14; Gal. i. 10.
n ii. 23.

αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς· 3. [f]αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς [g]αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς [h]ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε.[1] 4. [i]μοιχαλίδες,[2] οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἡ φιλία τοῦ [k]κόσμου[3] [l]ἔχθρα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν[4]; [m]ὃς ἐὰν[5] οὖν[6] βουληθῇ φίλος εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἐχθρὸς[7] τοῦ Θεοῦ καθίσταται.[m] 5. ἢ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ [n]γραφὴ λέγει· πρὸς φθόνον[8] ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ

[1] καταδαπανησητε ℵ[1]; δαπανησετε B, Weiss.
[2] Pr. μοιχοι και ℵ[3]KLP, curss.; μοιχοι Latt. (exc. *ff*), Pesh., Copt., Aeth., Arm.
[3] του κοσμου τουτου ℵ, 68, Vulg., Pesh., Arm., Aeth.
[4] εστιν τω Θεω ℵ, Copt., Ti.
[5] Om. ος ℵ; ος αν ℵ[3]AKL, curss., Thl., Oec., Treg.
[6] Om. L, curss. [7] εχθρα ℵ[1], 7. [8] λεγει προς φθ. A, curss., Arm.

obtained is because they are not asked for! Is it intended to be understood that this lust (in the sense, of course, of desiring) and covetousness are not gratified only because they had not been prayed for, or not properly prayed for? This is what the words mean as they stand; but can it ever be justifiable to pray for what is evil? There is something extraordinarily incongruous in the whole passage, which defies explanation if the words are to be taken in their obvious meaning. Only one thing seems clear, and that is a moral condition which is hopelessly chaotic.—Carr says that "these two verses are among the examples of poetical form in this Epistle"; perhaps this gives the key to the solution of the problem. It may be that we have in the whole of these verses 1-10 a string of quotations, not very skilfully strung together—a kind of "Stromateis"—taken from a variety of authorities, in order to make this protest against a disgraceful state of affairs more emphatic and authoritative.—**φονεύετε**: the reading **φθονεῖτε** cannot be entertained if any regard is to be paid to MS. authority; even if accepted it would not really simplify matters much.—**ζηλοῦτε**: refers rather to persons, **ἐπιθυμεῖτε** to things.

Ver. 3. **αἰτεῖτε . . . αἰτεῖσθε**: There does not seem to be any difference in meaning between the active and middle here: "If the middle is really the stronger word, we can understand its being brought in just where an effect of contrast can be secured, while in ordinary passages the active would carry as much weight as was needed" (Moulton, *op. cit.*, p. 160); *cf.* Mark vi. 22-25, x. 35-38; 1 John v. 15. —**δαπανήσητε**: *Cf.* Luke xv. 14, 30; Acts xxi. 24.

Ver. 4. **μοιχαλίδες**: the weight of evidence is strongly in favour of this reading as against **μοιχοὶ καὶ μοιχαλίδες**. The depraved state of morals to which the whole section bears witness must in part at least have been due to the wickedness and co-operation of the women, so that there is nothing strange in their being specifically mentioned in connection with that form of sin with which they would be more particularly associated.—**οὐκ οἴδατε . . . καθίσταται**: what seems to be in the mind of the writer is John xv. 18 ff. . . . **εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει· ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστέ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος . . .**—**καθίσταται**; "is constituted"; *cf.* the Vulgate *constituitur*.

Ver. 5. **ἡ γραφὴ λέγει πρὸς φθόνον . . .**: this attributing of personality to Scripture is paralleled, as Lightfoot points out (*Gal.* iii. 8), by the not uncommon Jewish formula of reference מִדָּה רָאָה "Quid vidit". According to Lightfoot the singular **γραφὴ** in the N.T. "always means a *particular passage* of Scripture; where the reference is clearly to the sacred writings as a whole, as in the expressions, 'searching the Scriptures,' 'learned in the Scriptures,' etc., the plural **γραφαί** is universally found, *e.g.*, Acts xvii. 11, xviii. 24, 28. . . . **Ἡ γραφὴ** is most frequently used in introducing a particular quotation, and in the very few instances where the quotation is not actually given, it is for the most part easy to fix the passage referred to. The biblical usage is followed also by the earliest fathers. The transition from the 'Scriptures' to the

°πνεῦμα ὃ ᵖκατῴκισεν[1] ἐν ἡμῖν[2]; 6. μείζονα δὲ ᵠδίδωσιν χάριν·ᵠ [3]διὸ λέγει· ᵠὁ Θεὸς[4] ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται,[5] ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.ᵠ[3] 7. ὑποτάγητε οὖν[6] τῷ Θεῷ· ἀντίστητε δὲ[7]

o Gal. v. 17.
p *Cf.* Gen. vi. 5, viii. 21; Num. xi. 29.
q—q Quoted from Prov. iii. 34 (Sept.); *cf.* Matt. xiii. 12; Job xxii. 29; Ps. cxxxviii. 6; Prov. xxix. 23; Matt. xxiii. 12. Luke i. 52; 1 Pet. v. 5.

[1] κατωκησεν KLP, curss., Latt., Syrr., Copt., Thl., Oec., rec.
[2] ημιν, Ti., vobis *ff*. [3—3] Om. LP, curss. [4] Add κυριος 5, 16.
[5] αντιτασσετε B. [6] Om. ουν *ff*.
[7] Om. δε KLP, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.

'Scripture' is analogous to the transition from **τὰ βιβλία** to the 'Bible'" (*ibid.*, pp. 147 f.). In the present instance the "Scripture" is nowhere to be found in the O.T.; it is, however, reflected in some Pauline passages, Gal. v. 17, 21, and *cf.* Rom. viii. 6, 8; 1 Cor. iii. 16: **ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός** (Gal. v. 17); **τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν** (1 Cor, iii. 16). It is difficult not to see a Pauline influence in our passage; and what is certainly noteworthy is the fact that the two *Agrapha* which the Epistle contains (i. 12 and the one before us) are both closely connected with St. Paul, i. 12 = 2 Tim. iv. 8; iv. 5 = Gal. v. 17. But that which is conclusive against the "Scripture" here referring to the O.T. is the fact that the doctrine of the Spirit is not found there in the developed form in which it is represented here; the pronounced personality of the Spirit as here used is never found in the O.T. The reference here must be to the N.T., and this is one of the many indications which point to the late date of our Epistle, or parts of it. As early a document as the Epistle of Polycarp (110 A.D.) refers once to the N.T. quotations as "Scripture"; and in the Epistle of Barnabas (about 98 A.D. according to Lightfoot, but regarded as later by most scholars) a N.T. quotation is prefaced by the formula "It is written".—**πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ . . .**: on this very difficult text see, for a variety of interpretations, Mayor's elaborate note; the best rendering seems to be that of the R.V. margin: "That Spirit which he made to dwell in us yearneth for us even unto jealous envy". The words witness to the truth that the third Person of the Holy Trinity abides in our hearts striving to acquire the same love for Him on our part which He bears for us. It is a most striking passage which tells of the love of the Holy Spirit, as (in one sense) distinct from that of the Father or that of the Son; in connection with it should be read Rom. viii. 26-28; Eph. iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 19.

Ver. 6. **μείζονα δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν**: these words further emphasise the developed doctrine of the Spirit referred to above; they point to the nature of divine grace, which is almost illimitable. These verses, 5, 6, witness in a striking way to the Christian doctrine of grace, and herein breathe a different spirit from that found in most of the Epistle.—**ὁ Θεὸς . . . χάριν**: *Cf.* Sir. x. 7, 12, 18; *Pss. of Sol.* ii. 25, iv. 28; the quotation is also found in 1 Pet. v. 5; taken with the preceding it teaches the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Ephrem Syrus quotes this as a saying of Christ's (*Opp.* iii. 93 E., ed. Assemani; quoted by Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 199).

Ver. 7. **ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ Θεῷ**: *Cf.* Heb. xii. 9, **οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ ζήσομεν**. It is not a question of subjection either to God or the devil, but rather one of the choice between self-will and God's will; it is the proud spirit that has to be curbed.—**ἀντίστητε δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν**: the two ideas contained in these words are very Jewish; in the first place, the withstanding of the devil is represented as being within the competence of *man;* the more specifically Christian way of putting the matter is best seen by comparing the words before us with the two following passages: Luke x. 17, **Ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ . . . λέγοντες· κύριε, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου.** And the passage in 1 Pet. v. 6 ff. which is parallel to the one before us, is prefaced by the words, "Casting all your anxiety upon Him, because He careth for you," and followed by the words, "And the God of all grace . . . shall Himself perfect, stablish, strengthen you". The

r Eph. vi. 11, 12; 1 Pet. v. 8, 9.
s 2 Chron. xv. 2; Zech. i. 3; Luke xv. 30; *cf.* Lam. iii. 57.
t Isa. i. 16.
u Jer. iv. 14; 1 Pet. i. 22·1 Jn. iii. 8.

τῷ [r]διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται[1] ἀφ' ὑμῶν· 8. [s]ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ,[2] καὶ ἐγγίσει[3] ὑμῖν. [t]καθαρίσατε χεῖρας, ἁμαρτωλοί, καὶ [u]ἁγνίσατε

[1] φευξετε B[1] (-ται B[2]).
[2] D(omi)no *s* Vulg[F]; ad dominum *ff*; add et ipse *ff*.
[3] εγγιει Treg., Ti.

difference between the Jewish and Christian doctrines of grace and free-will here cannot fail to be observed. It is useless to cite the words, "Be subject unto God," as indicating divine assistance in withstanding the devil, because the subject of thought in either passage is quite independent; the meaning is not that ability to withstand the devil is the result of being subject to God; but two courses of action are enjoined, in each of which man is represented as able to take the initiative.—In the second place, the representation of Satan (the devil) here is altogether Jewish; the Hebrew root from which "Satan" comes (שָׂטַן) means "to oppose," or "to act as an adversary"; the idea is very clearly brought out in Num. xxii. 22, where the noun is used: *And the Angel of Jahwe placed himself in the way for an adversary* (literally "for a Satan"). This is precisely the picture represented in the words before us; the ancient Hebrew idea of something in the way is to some extent present in the Greek **ὁ διάβολος**, from **διαβάλλω** "to throw across," *i.e.*, the pathway is impeded (*cf.* Eph. iv. 27, vi. 11). Jewish demonology was full of intensely materialistic conceptions; the presence of demons in various guise, or else invisible, was always feared; primarily it was bodily harm that they did; the idea of spiritual evil, as in the passage before us, was later, though both conceptions existed side by side. The words under consideration are possibly an inexact quotation from *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Naphth. viii. 4, "If ye work that which is good my children . . . and the devil shall flee from you". Knowling quotes an interesting parallel in Hermas, *Mand.*, xii. 5, 2, where in connection with the devil it is said, "If ye resist him he will be vanquished, and will flee from you disgraced".

Ver. 8. **ἐγγίσατε τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐγγίσει ὑμῖν**: here, again, we have what to Christian ears sounds rather like a reversal of the order of things; we should expect the order to be that expressed in such words as, "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you" (John xv. 16). The words before us seem to be a quotation (inexact) from Hos. xii. 6 (Sept.), **. . . ἔγγιζε πρὸς τὸν θεόν σου διὰ παντός.** The Hebrew phrase נגשׁ אל- is a technical term for approaching God for the purpose of worship, *e.g.*, Exod. xix. 22; Jer. xxx. 21; Ezek. xliv. 13. There is an extraordinary passage in *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Dan. vi. 1, 2 which runs, "And now, fear the Lord, my children, and beware of Satan and his spirits. Draw near unto God and to the angel that intercedeth for you, for he is a mediator between God and man" (the latter part here is not a Christian interpolation). — **καθαρίσατε χεῖρας**: *Cf.* Ps. xxiv. 4, **ἀθῷος χερσὶ καὶ καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ . . .**; in Hos. i. 16 we have, **λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε,** and in Sir. xxxviii. 10, **ἀπόστησον πλημμελίαν καὶ εὔθυνον χεῖρας, καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας καθάρισον καρδίαν.** In each case it is a metaphorical use of language which otherwise expressed the literal ritual washing; the former, taken from the latter, was in use at least as early as exilic times.—**ἁμαρτωλοί**: the close connection with this word and the **δίψυχοι** which follows almost immediately recalls the language in Sir. v. 9, **. . . οὕτως ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς ὁ δίγλωσσος.** —**ἁγνίσατε καρδίας**: the thought of these, as well as of the preceding words, is an adaptation of Ps. lxxii. (lxxiii.) 13, **Ἄρα ματαίως ἐδικαίωσα τὴν καρδίαν μου, καὶ ἐνιψάμην ἐν ἀθῴοις τὰς χεῖράς μου.** The verb **ἁγνίζω** (התקדשׁ) means originally to sanctify oneself preparatory to appearing before the Lord by separating oneself from everything that might cause uncleanness; the idea of separating oneself is still present in the passage before us, because mourning implied temporary withdrawal from the world and its doings. Mayor quotes in connection with this verse, Hermas, *Mand.*, ix. 7, **καθάρισον τὴν καρδίαν σου ἀπὸ τῆς διψυχίας.**—**δίψυχοι**: *Cf.* Hos. x. 2,

καρδίας,[1] [v]δίψυχοι. 9. ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ [2] [w]πενθήσατε [3] καὶ [4] κλαύσατε [5]· ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μετατραπήτω [6] καὶ ἡ χαρὰ εἰς [x]κατήφειαν. 10. [y]ταπεινώθητε [7] ἐνώπιον Κυρίου [8] καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς.

11. Μὴ [z]καταλαλεῖτε [9] ἀλλήλων, ἀδελφοί· [9] [10] ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἢ [11] [a]κρίνων τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καταλαλεῖ νόμου καὶ κρίνει νόμον·

v i. 18. w Matt. v. 4. x Wisd. xvii. 4. y 1 Pet. v. 6. z 1 Pet. ii. 1; Eph. iv. 31. a Matt. vii. 1.

[1] Add vestra *ff*. [2] Om. *ff*. [3] Miseri *ff*.
[4] Om. Ti. [5] Om. **και κλαυσατε** 15, curss., Pesh.
[6] **μεταστραφητω** ℵAKL, curss., Oec., Ti., Treg., WH (altern. reading).
[7] Add **ουν** ℵ, 56. [8] Pr. **του** D, curss., Weiss.
[9—9] **αδελφοι μου αλληλων** A, curss. [10] Frater. *ff*. [11] **και** KL, curss., rec. et *ff*.

and in addition to the passages referred to above, i. 8, *cf.* Barnabas xix. 5, **οὐ μὴ διψυχήσῃς, πότερον ἔσται ἢ οὔ**, and the identical words in Did. iv. 4.

Ver. 9. **ταλαιπωρήσατε**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T. *cf.* Mic. ii. 4; Jer. iv. 13; "undergo hardship"; it was a recognised tenet in Jewish theology that self-inflicted punishment of any kind was a means of reconciliation, *e.g.*, in *Mechilta*, 76*a*, the words of Ps. lxxxix. 32 (33 in Heb.), *I will visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes*, are interpreted to mean that the pain suffered under liberal chastisement is one of the means of reconciliation with God; for instances of how chastisement has reconciled men to God, see *Baba mezia*, 84*a b*.—**πενθήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε**: these words are found together in 2 Esdras xviii. 9 (= Neh. viii. 9); and in Luke vi. 25 we have, **οὐαὶ ὑμῖν οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.** Repentance (תְּשׁוּבָה) was, according to Jewish teaching, also in itself another of the means of reconciliation.—**ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μετατραπήτω**: **μετατραπ. ἅπ.λεγ.** in N.T.; *cf.* Am. viii. 10, **καὶ μεταστρέψω τὰς ἑορτὰς ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος.**—**καὶ ἡ χαρὰ εἰς κατήφειαν**: *Cf.* Jer. xvi. 9; Prov. xiv. 13; the words express the contrast between the loud unseemly gaiety of the pleasure-seeker, and the subdued mien and downcast look of the penitent. **κατήφειαν** occurs only here in the N.T.; it is often found in Philo.

Ver 10. **ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον Κυρίου καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς**: *Cf.* Sir. ii. 17, **οἱ φοβούμενοι Κύριον ἑτοιμάσουσι καρδίας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ταπεινώσουσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν**, and *cf.* iii. 18; in the *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Jos. xviii. 1, we read, "If ye also, therefore, walk in the commandments of the Lord, my children, He will exalt you there (*i.e.*, on high), and will bless you with good things for ever and ever". Although the actual word is not mentioned in these vv. 7-10, it is obvious that they constitute a call to repentance. Both as establishing a proper relationship towards God, and as a means of bringing about that relationship, the need of repentance had always been greatly insisted on by Jewish teachers; in *Pirqe Aboth*, *e.g.*, iv. 15, it is said, "Repentance and good works are as a shield against punishment"; and Taylor quotes *Berachoth*, 17*a*, "It was a commonplace in the mouth of Raba that, The perfection of wisdom is repentance," *cf. Bereshith Rabba*, lxv.; *Nedarim*, 32*b*, etc., etc.

Vv. 11, 12. The subject of these verses, speaking against and judging others, is the same as that of the section ii. 1-13; they follow on quite naturally after vv. 12, 13 of that chapter, while they have nothing to do with the context in which they now stand. They constitute a weaving together of several quotations, much after the style of the section which precedes.

Ver. 11. **Μὴ καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων, ἀδελφοί**, etc.: this speaking against one another must be taken together with the judging of one another; it is a question of deciding who is and who is not observing the *Torah*; some of the brethren were evidently arrogating to themselves the right of settling what did and what did not constitute obedience to the *Torah*, and those who, according to the idea of the former, were not keeping the *Torah*, were denounced and spoken against. Difficulties of this kind were bound to be constantly arising in a community of Jewish-Christians; if unnumbered differences of opinion with regard to legal observances was characteristic,

b 1 Macc. ii. 67; Rom. ii. 13. c Is. xxxiii. 22. d Matt. vii. 1. e Matt. x. 28. f Rom. ii. 1, xiv. 4. g v. 1. h Prov. xxvii. 1; Luke xii. 18-20. i Matt. xx. 12. k 2 Pet. ii. 3.

εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις, οὐκ εἶ [1] [b] ποιητὴς νόμου ἀλλὰ κριτής. 12. εἷς ἐστιν [c] νομοθέτης [2] καὶ [d] κριτής,[3] ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ [e] ἀπολέσαι· σὺ δὲ [4] τίς εἶ, ὁ κρίνων [5] τὸν [f] πλησίον [6]; 13. [g] Ἄγε [7] νῦν οἱ λέγοντες· [h] σήμερον ἢ [8] αὔριον πορευσόμεθα [9] εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν καὶ [i] ποιήσομεν [10] ἐκεῖ ἐνιαυτὸν [12] καὶ [k] ἐμπορευ-

[1] ουκετι KP, curss. [2] Pr. ο ℵAKL, curss., Ti., Treg., WH mg.
[3] Om. και κριτης KL, curss., rec. [4] Om. δε Sah., Arm., Oec., rec.
[5] ος κρινεις KL, curss., rec.
[6] ετερον KL, curss., rec.; add οτι ουκ εν ανθρωπω αλλ εν Θεω τα διαβηματα ανθρωπου κατευθυνεται K, curss.
[7] Jam *ff*. [8] και AKLP, curss., Cyr., Thl., Oec., rec.
[9] πορευσωμεθα AKL, curss., Thl. [10] ποιησωμεν ℵAKL, curss., Treg.
[11] Om. A, 13, Cyr. [12] Add ενα AKL, curss., Syrr., Arm., Cyr., Thl., Oec., rec.

as we know it to have been, of Rabbinism, it was the most natural thing in the world for Jewish-Christians to differ upon the extent to which they held the *Torah* to be binding. The writer of the Epistle is finding fault on two counts; firstly, the fact of the brethren speaking against one another at all, and secondly, their presuming to decide what was and what was not *Torah*-observance. — **καταλαλεῖ νόμου καὶ κρίνει νόμον**: the reason why speaking against and judging a brother is equivalent to doing the same to the Law is because the Law has been misinterpreted and misapplied; the Law had, in fact, been maligned; it had been made out to be something that it was not. It is not a general principle, therefore, which is being laid down here, *viz.*: that speaking against a brother or judging a brother is always necessarily speaking against and judging the Law; these things are breaches of the Law, but not necessarily for that reason denunciation of it; the point here, as already remarked, is a maligning of the Law by making it out to be something that it was not. It is not a general principle, but a specific case, which is referred to here.— **εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις, οὐκ εἶ ποιητὴς . . . κριτής**: here again it is a specific case which is referred to; as a general principle the statement would be contrary to fact, for it is possible to give a judgment upon the Law, in the sense of criticising it, or even to denounce it, and yet obey it; the Rabbis were constantly discussing and giving their judgments on points of the Law, and were nevertheless earnest observers of its precepts. When a man misinterpreted the Law, and then acted upon that misinterpretation, and denounced others who did not do likewise, then he was truly not a doer of the Law, but a judge,—and a very bad one too.

Ver. 12. **εἷς ἐστιν νομοθέτης καὶ κριτής**; the words are intended to show the arrogant impertinence of those who were judging their neighbours on a misinterpretation of the Law. The word **νομοθέτης** does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., though **νομοθετέω** and **νομοθεσία** do; *cf.* Ps. xxvii. 11.—**ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι**: *Cf.* Matt. x. 28, **τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γεέννῃ**, and Luke vi. 9.—**σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων τὸν πλησίον**: we find very similar words in Rom. xiv. 4, **σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην**; In *Pirqe Aboth*, i. 7, we read, "Judge every man in the scale of merit," *i.e.*, Give every man the benefit of the doubt (Taylor); *cf. Shabbath*, 127*b*, "He who thus judges others will thus himself be judged".

Vv. 13-17 form an independent section entirely unconnected with what precedes or follows. The section is very interesting as giving a picture of the commercial *Diaspora*-Jew. The Jews of the Dispersion had, from the outset, to give up agricultural pursuits; since for the most part they congregated in the cities it was commerce in which they engaged chiefly. A good instance of the *Diaspora*-Jew going from city to city occurs in Josephus, *Antiq.*, xii. 2-5 (160-185), though the period dealt with is far anterior to that of our Epistle. Egypt was, of course, the greatest centre of attraction, and many wealthy Jews were to be numbered among the large Jewish population of

σόμεθα[1] καὶ κερδήσομεν[2]· 14. οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπίστασθε[3] τῆς[1] αὔ-
ριον[4]· ποία[5] ἡ[6] ζωὴ ὑμῶν[7]; ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστε[8] ἡ[9] πρὸς ὀλίγον
φαινομένη, ἔπειτα καὶ[10] ἀφανιζομένη.[1] 15. ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς·

1—11 i. 10; Job vii. 7; Ps. xxxix. 6, 12; cii. 3; Luke xii. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 31.

[1] εμπορευσωμεθα KL, curss. [2] κερδησωμεν KL, curss. [3] επισταντε P, 68.

[4] το της αυρ. אKL, curss., Latt., Pesh., Sah., Copt., Thl., Oec., Treg., Ti.; τα της αυρ. AP, 7, 13, 69, 106, *a*, *c*, Syrhk, Tregmg, WH (altern. reading).

[5] Add γαρ א[3]AKLP, curss., Tregmg (WH altern. reading); add autem *ff*.

[6] Om. B. [7] ημων 13, 69, Syrhk, Thl.; *ff* runs on without the interrogative.

[8] Om. ατμις γαρ εστε א; om. γαρ A, Vulg., Copt.; momentum enim est *ff*. Vulg., Copt., Thl. read εστιν; AKP, curss. read εσται.

[9] Om. η BP, WH.

[10] Pr. δε LPב, curss.; δε Sah., Thl., Oec.; om. 36, 38, 69, Syrhk, Copt.

Alexandria; Philo speaks of Jewish shipowners and merchants in this city (*In Flaccum*, viii.). When such Jews embraced Christianity there would be, obviously, no reason for them to give up their calling. It must, however, be confessed that both this section and the following read far more naturally as addressed to Jews than to Jewish-Christians.

Ver. 13.—**Ἄγε**: this expression of disapproval occurs only here and in v. 1 in the N.T.; although it is used here and there in the Septuagint, it is the rendering of different Hebrew words; one may compare, though it is not the equivalent of **ἄγε**, the Aramaic expression of disapproval הוֹי לָכֶן ("Ah you!" literally "Woe unto you"). **Ἄγε** is used with either a singular or a plural subject, *cf.* Jud. xix. 6; 2 Kings iv. 24.—**σήμερον ἢ αὔριον πορευσόμεθα**: *Cf.* Prov. xxvii. 1, **μὴ καυχῶ τὰ εἰς αὔριον, οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα.** There is a Rabbinical saying, in *Sanhed.*, 100*b*, which runs: "Care not for the morrow, for ye know not what a day may bring forth. Perhaps he may not be [alive] on the morrow, and so have cared for a world that does not exist for him" (quoted by Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 539); *cf.* Luke xii. 16 ff.; xiii. 32, 33.—**ἐμπορευσόμεθα**: 2 Pet. ii. 3 is the only other passage in the N.T. in which this word occurs; it means primarily "to travel," then to travel for the purpose of trading, and finally "to trade" simply.—**κερδήσομεν**: a rare form; "the Attic is **κερδανῶ**, with aorist **ἐκέρδανα**, Ion. and late Attic **κερδήσομαι**, aorist **ἐκέρδησα**; the latter occurs often in the N.T." (Mayor).

Ver. 14. **οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπίστασθε τὸ τῆς αὔριον**: "Ye are they that know not . . ."; it is the contrast between the ignorance of men, with the consequent incertitude of all that the morrow may bring forth, and the knowledge of God in accordance with Whose will (*cf.* **ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ** in the next verse) all things come to pass.—**ποία ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν**; "Of what kind is your life"? The reference here is not to the life of the wicked, but to the uncertainty of human life in general; the thought of the ungodly being cut off is, it is true, often expressed in the Bible, but that is not what is here referred to; it is evidently not conscious sin, but thoughtlessness which the writer is rebuking here.—**ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστε**: the reading **ἐστε**, in preference to **ἐστι** or **ἔσται**, makes the address more personal; **ἀτμὶς** is often used for "smoke," *e.g.*, Acts ii. 17; *cf.* Ps. cii. 3 (4), **ἐξέλιπον ὡσεὶ καπνὸς αἱ ἡμέραι μου**; the word only occurs here in the N.T., in Acts ii. 19 it is a quotation from Joel ii. 30 (Sept.) iii. 3 (Heb.). In Job vii. 7 we have **μνήσθητι ὅτι πνεῦμά μου ἡ ζωή**, *cf.* Wisd. ii. 4; the rendering "breath" instead of "vapour" does not commend itself on account of the former being invisible, and the point of the words is that man does *appear* for a little time (**πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη**) and then disappears, *cf.* Wisd. xvi. 6.—**ἀφανιζομένη**: the word occurs, though in a different connection, in Sir. xlv. 26.

Ver. 15. **ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς**: "A classical writer would rather have said **δέον λέγειν** or **οἵτινες βέλτιον ἂν εἶπον**" (Mayor).—**ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ**: *Cf. Berachoth*, 17*a*, "It is revealed and known before Thee that our will is to do Thy will" (quoted by Taylor,

m Acts xviii. 21; *cf.* Dan. v 23.
n Rom. i. 30; 2 Tim. iii. 2; 1 Jn. ii. 16.

ἐὰν ὁ Κύριος [m] θελήσῃ,[1] καὶ ζήσομεν[2] καὶ[3] ποιήσομεν[4] τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο.[5] 16. νῦν δὲ καυχᾶσθε[6] ἐν ταῖς [n] ἀλαζονίαις[7] ὑμῶν· πᾶσα[8] [o] καύχησις τοιαύτη πονηρά ἐστιν. 17. [p] εἰδότι οὖν[9] καλὸν ποιεῖν καὶ μὴ ποιοῦντι,[10] ἁμαρτία αὐτῷ[11] ἐστιν.[p]

o 1 Cor. v. 6; *cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 4. p—p Luke xii. 47, 48; Jn. ix. 41, xv. 22; Rom. xiv. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 21; *cf.* Rom. i. 20, 21, 32, ii. 17, 18, 23; 1 Tim. i. 13.

[1] θελη BP, 69, *a*, *d*, Tregmg, WH.

[2] ζησωμεν KL♁, curss., Cyr., Thl., Oec.; pr. si Vulg. (om. *s* Vulg^{A}).

[3] Om. Vulg., Pesh., Sah., Copt., Arm., Aeth, Cyr.

[4] ποιησωμεν KL♁, curss., Thl., Oec.

[5] Totum comma deest *s*.

[6] κατακαυχασθε ℵ, 7.

[7] αλαζονειαις B^{3}K, Treg., Weiss; superbia *ff*.

[8] απασα ℵ.

[9] Scientibus autem *ff*.

[10] Facientibus *ff*.

[11] Illis *ff*.

op. cit., p. 29); *cf.* John vii. 17, **ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται . . .** In the Hebrew commentary on a curious little work called *The Book of the Alphabet of Ben Sira* there occur the words אִם גּוֹזֵר שֵׁם, *i.e.*, "If the Name (= God) wills"; and it is said that this formula should never be omitted when a man is about to undertake anything. This passage occurs in the comment on the eleventh proverb of the "Alphabet," which runs: "The bride enters the bridal chamber and, nevertheless, knows not what will befall her". The formula, "If the Name wills," is, according to Ginsberg, of Mohammedan origin, "for the use of formulas was introduced to the Jews by the Mohammedans". The formula is, of course, not Ben Sira's, as it forms no part of the work ascribed to him; the commentary in which it occurs belongs to about the year 1000 probably (see *Jewish Encycl.*, ii. 678 f.). *Cf.*, further, Acts xviii. 21, **τοῦ θεοῦ θέλοντος**, 1 Cor. iv. 19, **ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ**; and in *Pirqe Aboth*, ii. 4 occur the words of Rabban Gamliel (middle of third century A.D.), "Do His will as if it were thy will, that He may do thy will as if it were His will. Annul thy will before His will, that He may annul the will of others before thy will" (Taylor). **—καὶ ζήσομεν καὶ . . .** both life and action depend upon God's will.

Ver. 16. **νῦν δὲ**: "but now," *i.e.*, as things are; *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 6, **νῦν δὲ, ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν ἔλθω . . .—καυχᾶσθε ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονίαις ὑμῶν**: those vauntings were, of course, not on account of following out their own will in despite of the divine will, but because of the thoughtlessness which did not take God's will into account, and therefore boasted of the ability of following one's own bent. Both are bad, but conscious opposition to the will of God would, of the two, be worse. **Ἀλαζονίαις** comes from **ἀλαζών** which is literally a "wanderer," then it comes to mean one who makes pretensions. *Cf.* Prov. xxvii. 1, **μὴ καυχῶ τὰ εἰς αὔριον, οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα**: the word occurs only here and in 1 John ii. 16 (**ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου**) in the N.T.—**πᾶσα καύχησις τοιαύτη . . .**: boasting of this kind must be evil because it forgets God, and unduly exalts self.

Ver. 17. Although this verse may be regarded as standing independent of what has preceded, and as being in the form of a more or less inexact quotation, it is quite permissible to take it with what has gone before. Those to whom the words have been addressed had, to some extent, erred through thoughtlessness; now that things have been made quite plain to them, they are in a position to know how to act; if, therefore, in spite of knowing now how to act aright, the proper course is neglected, then it is sinful. This seems to be the point of the words of this verse.—The words are perhaps an echo of Luke xii. 47, **ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνοὺς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ δαρήσεται πολλάς.** With **καλὸν ποιεῖν** *cf.* Gal. vi. 9, **τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐνκακῶμεν.—ἁμαρτία αὐτῷ ἐστιν**: for the converse of this, namely, doing what is wrong in ignorance—in which case it is excusable—see Acts iii. 17, "And now, brethren, I wot that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers"; 1 Tim. i 13, ". . . howbeit, I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief".—It is, however, quite possible that we have in these words the enunciation of the principle that sins of omission

V. 1. [a]"Αγε νῦν οἱ [b] πλούσιοι, κλαύσατε [1] ὀλολύζοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς

a iv. 13.
b Am. vi. 1; Prov. xi. 28; Luke vi. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 9.

[1] κλαυσονται 13.

are as sinful as those of commission; when our Lord says, ". . . these things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone" (Matt. xxiii. 23), it is clear that the sins of omission are regarded as wilful sin equally with those of commission, *cf.* Matt. xxv. 41-45. There is always a tendency to reckon the things which are left undone as less serious than actually committed sin; this was certainly, though not wholly so, in Judaism. It is exceptional when we read, for example, in 1 Sam. xii. 23, "God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you"; as a rule sins of omission are regarded as venial, according to the Jewish doctrine, and are not punishable. The conception of sin according to Rabbinical ideas is well seen in what is called the *'Al Chêt* (*i.e.*, "For the sin," from the opening words of each sentence in the great *Widdui* ["Confession"] said on *Yom Kippur* ["the Day of Atonement"]); in the long list of sins here, mention is made only of committed sins. In the Jerusalem Talmud (*Yoma*, viii. 6) it is said that the Day of Atonement brings atonement, even without repentance, for sins of omission; in *Pesikta*, 7*b* the words in Zeph. i. 12. "I will search Jerusalem with candles, and I will punish the men . . .," are commented on by saying, "not by daylight, nor with the torch, but with candles, so as not to detect venial sins," among these being, of course, included sins of omission. Although this is, in the main, the traditional teaching, there are some exceptions to be found, *e.g.*, *Shabbath*, 54*b*; "'Whosoever is in a position to prevent sins being committed by the members of his household, but refrains from doing so, becomes liable for their sins.' The same rule applies to the govenour of a town, or even of a whole country" (see *Jewish Encycl.*, xi. 378).

Having regard to the very Jewish character of our Epistle, it is quite possible that in the verse before us the reference is to this subject of sins of omission.

Chapter V.—Chap. V. contains five distinct sections; of great interest is the fact that the first two—1-6, 7-11—deal respectively with Jewish and Christian Eschatology; this subject will be dealt with presently; ver. 12 is a short section containing an adaptation of some words from the "Sermon on the Mount"; 13-18 deals with the subject of the visitation of the sick in the early Church; while vv. 19, 20 bring the Epistle to an abrupt termination with a very pronounced utterance upon the Jewish doctrine of works. Each of these sections is self-contained, and it would be impossible to have a clearer or more pointed illustration than this chapter offers of the "patchwork" character of our Epistle.

It will not be necessary, in dealing with the very large subject of Jewish Eschatology, to do more than indicate very briefly its connection with the section vv. 1-6 of this chapter; at the same time, a slight reference to its leading ideas is essential, as some of these are referred in this passage; one of these is the punishment about to overtake the wicked —who are often identified with the *rich* —in the "last days". Jewish Eschatology, or the "Doctrine of the last things," is based on the teaching of the O.T. prophets regarding the "Day of the Lord," or, as the phrase runs, "the last day," or "last time"; another formula which occurs frequently is "in those days". "By the time of the New Testament period Judaism was in possession of most, if not all, of its eschatological ideas. These had been developed during the two eventful centuries that immediately preceded the rise of Christianity. It was these centuries which saw the rise of the *Apocalyptic Movement* with its vast eschatological developments that were essentially bound up with the doctrine of a future life, and a belief in a judgment after death, with rewards and punishments" (Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.*, p. 211). The four outstanding subjects that the doctrine of the last things comprises are: (1) The signs of the approach of the "Messianic Era"—this latter took the place of the "Day of the Lord" in the development of eschatological thought, (2) the actual advent of the Messiah, together with the great events that should then come to pass, *viz.*, the ingathering of Israel and the resurrection of the dead; (3) The judgment upon the wicked; (4) The blessedness of the righteous (*Cf.* the writer's *The Doctrine of the Last Things*). In

c Rom. iii. 16.
d Matt. vi. 19, 20.

[c] ταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις.[1] 2. ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν [d] σέ-

[1] Add υμιν ℵ, 5, 8, 25, Vulg., Pesh., Copt., Arm., Aeth.

the passage before us (vv. 1-6) three of the above are referred to, *viz.*, the Messianic Era; the punishment of the wicked, and (implicitly) the blessedness of the righteous. In ver. 3 the phrase **ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις** points indubitably to the times of the Messiah; the language is that of *Jewish* Eschatology based on prophetic teaching (*cf.* Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1; Hos. iii. 5; Joel iii. 1; Am. viii. 11, ix. 11; Zech. viii. 23). In vv. 1, 3 the punishment of the wicked is referred in the words, **κλαύσατε ὀλολύζοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς ταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις: . . . καὶ ὁ ἰὸς αὐτῶν . . . φάγεται τὰς σάρκας ὑμῶν ὡς πῦρ**; as illustrating this *cf. Book of Enoch* xcvi. 8, "Woe unto you mighty who violently oppress the righteous, for the day of your destruction will come; in that time many happy days will come for the righteous, then shall ye be condemned"; xciv. 7, 8, 9, "Woe to those that build their houses with sin . . .; and those who acquire gold and silver will perish in judgment suddenly. Woe to you, ye rich, for ye have trusted in your riches. . . . Ye have committed blasphemy and unrighteousness, and have become ready for the day of slaughter and the day of darkness and the day of the great judgment"; xcv. 7, "Woe to you sinners, for ye persecute the righteous . . .; xcvi. 4, "Woe unto you, ye sinners, for your riches make you appear like the righteous . . . and this word shall be a testimony against you"; many other similar quotations could be given, the striking resemblance in thought and language with our passage cannot fail to be observed; see further below, ver. 1. And lastly, in ver. 6, there is an implicit reference to the happiness of the righteous, in the words, **κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον· οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν**; that is to say, the righteous can afford to suffer such ill-treatment because he knows that the time of blessedness is coming for him; this is also frequently referred to in the Book of Enoch, *e.g.*, xcvi. 1, "Be hopeful, ye righteous; for suddenly will the sinners perish before you, and ye will have lordship over them according to your desires; 3, Wherefore, fear not, ye that suffer; for healing will be your portion". The non-mention in our passage of the actual advent of the Messiah by name was characteristic of Jewish usage at certain periods, and is significant here. On the other hand, the section comprising vv. 7-11 is wholly Christian; the utterly different tone and language of this, as compared with the section vv. 1-6, cannot be accounted for by saying that the one is addressed to the wicked, the other to the righteous; because in the latter there is a distinct reference to those who are in danger of being judged on account of murmuring against one another (ver. 9). But there are one or two points whereby the respectively Jewish and Christian form of Eschatology may be clearly discerned. (1) The language on which Jewish eschatological ideas are based is that of the prophets; the section vv. 1-6 is steeped in O.T. phraseology; on the other hand, the actual references to the Advent in vv. 7-11 are in N.T. language; the O.T. references in this section have nothing to do with the Advent. (2) It is characteristic of Jewish Eschatology that, generally speaking, there is indefiniteness as to when the Messianic Era will be inaugurated; it differs herein somewhat from the prophetical teaching, owing, as a matter of fact, to the rise of apocalyptic conceptions: on the other hand, the Christian, like the prophetical, view of the Advent is that it will take place in the very near future ("... behold the judge standeth at the door"). (3) In Jewish pre-Christian eschatological literature the Messianic Era is frequently depicted without any reference to the personality of the Messiah; on the other hand, in the N.T., it is the rule that when the second Advent is referred to Christ is mentioned under the titles of the "Son of Man" or the "Lord" (*cf.* Matt. x. 23, xiii. 41, 42, xvi. 27, 28, xix. 28, xxv. 31-33, etc., Phil. iv. 5, **ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς**, 1 Cor. xvi. 22, **μαρὰν ἀθά**, and see *Didache*, x. 6, **εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἐστί, μετανοείτω· μαρὰν ἀθά. ἀμήν**). (4) Besides there being no reference to the personality of the Messiah in the Jewish eschatological section there is the further contrast between it and the Christian section that in the latter the distinctively Christian expression **ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου** twice occurs; against this the Jewish section

σηπεν, καὶ τὰ [e]ἱμάτια ὑμῶν [f]σητόβρωτα γέγονεν· 3. ὁ χρυσὸς ὑμῶν [1]καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος [g]κατίωται,[1] καὶ ὁ ἰὸς αὐτῶν εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν

e *Cf.* ii. 2.
f Bar.vi.12; Job xiii. 28.
g Sir.xii.11.

[1—1] κατιωται και ο αργυρος Aℶ, 13.

makes use of the distinctively Jewish title for God, the "Lord of Sabaoth".

It is thus difficult to resist the conclusion that we have here, in the section vv. 1-6, a passage which did not originally belong to the Epistle at all, but was taken or adapted from some Jewish eschatological work; it will be generally acknowledged that this section has absolutely nothing specifically Christian about it. That the writer (compiler?) should have incorporated this in his Epistle is quite natural, seeing that he was writing to Jews; equally as natural is it that he should, as a Christian writing to (Jewish-) Christians, add the developed Christian form of the same subject, interspersing it with O.T. references for the sake of his hearers [see further, *Bk. of Jubilees*, i. 29, v. 12, xxiii. 26-30; *Enoch*, x. 13, xvi. 1; *Ass. of Moses*, i. 18, x. 13; *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Reuben, vi. 8; *Apoc. Bar.* xxvii. 15, xxix. 8, lvi. 2; 4 *Esdr.* ix. 5].

Ver. 1. **Ἄγε νῦν**: See above iv. 13. —**κλαύσατε ὀλολύζοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς ταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις**: according to the original prophetic conception these "miseries" which were to overtake the wicked, were to come to pass in the "Day of the Lord," *i.e.*, during the Messianic Era; this belief became extended during the development of ideas which took place during the two centuries preceding the Christian Era. Whatever the reasons were which brought about the belief, it is certain that the expression "those days" came to be applied to a certain period which was immediately to *precede* the coming of the Messiah; without doubt a number of prophetical passages were regarded as suggesting this (see below). The descriptions given of these "days," which are to foretell the advent of the Messiah, belong to apocalyptic conceptions; in their general outline the "signs" of these times are identical. Prophetical passages such as the following laid the foundation: "The iniquity of Ephraim is bound up; his sin is laid up in store. The sorrows of a travailing woman shall come upon him . . ."; then, on the other hand, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death . . ." (Hos. xiii. 12-14); again, ". . . The day of thy watchmen, even thy visitation, is come; now shall be their perplexity. Trust ye not in a friend, put ye not confidence in a guide . . . for the son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother . . . a man's enemies are the men of his own house" (Mic. vii. 4-6); another characteristic which played a great part in the later apocalypse is contained in Joel ii. 10 ff., "the earth quaketh before them; the heavens tremble; the sun and the moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining. . . . *Cf.* Zech. xiv. 6 ff.; Dan. xii. 1, etc., etc. Throughout the immense domain of apocalyptic literature these themes are developed to an enormous extent; they are familiar to us from the Gospels, Matt. xxiv., xxv.; Mark xiii. 14-27; Luke xxi. 9-19. In Jewish literature references to them also occur with frequency; this period is called the time of "travail," and more specifically, the "birth-pangs," or "sufferings" of the Messiah—*Cheble ha-Meshiach*, or *Cheblo shel Mashiach*, see *Pesikta rab.*, xxi. 34; *Shabbath*, 118*a*; *Sanhedrin*, 96*b*, 97*a*, etc., etc. See further Oesterley, *The Doctrine of the Last Things*, chap. vii. The great diffusion and immense popularity which the apocalyptic literature enjoyed makes it certain that the writer of our Epistle was familiar with the subject; the "miseries," therefore, referred to in the passage before us may quite possibly have reference to the sufferings which were to take place in the time of travail preceding the actual coming of the Messiah.—**ὀλολύζοντες**: only here in the N.T., but fairly frequent in the Septuagint, Isa. xiii. 6; Joel i. 5, 13; Jer. iv. 8, etc.; in the first of these passages the connection is the same as here, . . . **ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου**, and see Luke vi. 24, "Woe unto you rich . . .," which is strongly reminiscent of the verse before us.

Ver. 2. The use of the Hebraic prophetic perfects in this passage is another mark of Jewish authorship. **ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν**: this cannot refer to wealth in the abstract because this would be out of harmony with the rest of the verse which

h *Cf.* Prov. xvi. 27. ἔσται [1] καὶ φάγεται [2] τὰς σάρκας ὑμῶν ὡς [3] [h] πῦρ. [4] [i] ἐθησαυρί-
i Rom. ii. 5; σατε [5] ἐν [k] ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. [6] 4. ἰδοὺ [7] ὁ [l] μισθὸς [8] τῶν ἐργατῶν
cf. Mic. vi. 10; Matt. vi. 19. τῶν ἀμησάντων τὰς [m] χώρας ὑμῶν ὁ ἀφυστερημένος [9] ἀφ' ὑμῶν [10]

k *Cf.* v. 8, 9. Luke xxi. 21. l Lev. xix. 13; Job xxiv. 10, 11; Jer. xxii. 13; Sir. iv. 1, xxxiv. 22. m *Cf.*

[1] Om. *s*. [2] φαινετε א[1]. [3] Pr. ο ιος AP ב, curss.
[4] Add ο Aeth., Thl. [5] Add vobis iram Vulg. (om. *s*, om. iram Vulg[F]).
[6] ημεραις εσχαταις A. [7] Pr. et *ff*. [8] Mercedes *ff*.
[9] απεστερημενος AB[3]P, curss.; αποστερημενος KL; quod abnegastis *ff*.
[10] Om. αφ υμων *ff*.

speaks of literal destruction; we have here precisely the same idea, as to actual destruction, as that which occurs in the eschatological passage *Enoch*, xcviii. 1 ff., where in reference to foolish men "in royalty, and in grandeur, and in power, and in silver and in gold, and in purple . . .," it says that "they will perish thereby together with their possessions and with all their glory and their splendour".—**σέσηπεν**: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T., *cf.* Sir. xiv. 19, **πᾶν ἔργον σηπόμενον ἐκλείπει.**—**σητόβρωτα**: ἅπ. λεγ· in N.T., *cf.* Job xiii. 28, **παλαιοῦται ὥσπερ ἱμάτιον σητόβρωτον**; Sir. xlii. 13, **ἀπὸ γὰρ ἱματίων ἐκπορεύεται σής.** For the form of the word *cf.* **σκωληκόβρωτος** in Acts xii. 23.

Ver. 3. **κατίωται**: in Sir. xii. 11 we have **καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τέλος κατίωσεν** in reference to a mirror; the Hebrew, which is followed by the Syriac, is corrupt, but evidently read חֲלֹאָה, which is the same word used in the preceding verse (**ἰοῦται**); the Hebrew word may perhaps be used in the sense of "filth" (see Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, s.v.), and possibly this more general term is what was originally intended in the verse before us, since gold cannot strictly be said to rust. The word occurs in one other passage *viz.*, in Sir., xxix. 10, but unfortunately the Hebrew for this is wanting. The force of the **κατα** is intensive.—**ὁ ἰὸς**: used in iii. 8 of the poison of the tongue, in a figurative sense; the meaning "rust" is secondary.—**εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν ἔσται**: this metaphor is quite in the Hebrew style; עֵד (= **μαρτύριον**), though generally used of persons, is in a fair number of instances used of inanimate things in the O.T.; *cf.* in the N.T. Mark vi. 11; Luke ix. 5.—**φάγεται**: a Hellenistic form, unclassical, *cf.* Sir. xxxiii, 23 (Sept.) **πᾶν βρῶμα φάγεται κοιλία**, *cf.* xi. 19, xlv. 21 (Sept.). —**τὰς σάρκας ὑμῶν**: "The plural **σάρκες** is used for the fleshy parts of the body both in classical and later writers . . . while the singular **σάρξ** is used for the whole body" (Mayor); in the Septuagint we meet with a similar phrase in a number of cases, *e.g.*, Mic. iii. 3. . . . **κατέφαγον τὰς σάρκας τοῦ λαοῦ μου**; 2 Kings ix. 36; in these and other instances the Hebrew בָּשָׂר (= **σάρξ**) is always in the singular (unlike "blood," which is often used in the plural).—**ὡς πῦρ**: this comparison must probably have been suggested by the fact that fire, in a literal sense, often figures in apocalyptic pictures, *cf.*, *e.g.*, *Enoch*, cii. 1, "And in those days when He brings a grievous fire upon you, whither will ye flee, and where will ye find deliverance?" xcviii. 3, where mention is made of "the furnace of fire," x. 13, "the abyss of fire"; this idea arose originally because "Gehenna" was conceived of as the place of torment, and a fire in the literal sense was constantly burning in the valley of Hinnom; the fire in the place of torment is referred to in Matt. xxv. 41 **τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον**, Mark ix. 44 **ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται**, Jude 7 **πυρὸς αἰωνίου . . .** See Carr's interesting note on **ὡς πῦρ.** **ἐθησαυρίσατε.—ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις**: see prefatory note to this chapter.

Ver. 4. **ἰδοὺ**: this interjection, though good Attic, is used by some N.T. writers with a frequency which is unclassical, (Mayor) *e.g.*, in this short Epistle it occurs six times, while on the other hand St. Paul uses it only nine times (once in a quotation) in the whole of his writings; its frequent occurrence is a mark of Jewish authorship, as Jews were accustomed to the constant use of an equivalent interjection (הִנֵּה) in their own tongue. —**ὁ μισθὸς τῶν ἐργατῶν**: **μισθός** occurs several times in Sir. in the sense

κράζει,[1] καὶ αἱ [n] βοαὶ τῶν θερισάντων εἰς τὰ ὦτα Κυρίου [o] σα-
βαὼθ εἰσελήλυθαν.[2] 5. [p] ἐτρυφήσατε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ[3] [q] ἐσπατα-
λήσατε, [r] ἐθρέψατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ἐν[4] ἡμέρᾳ[5] [s] σφαγῆς.

n Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Is. v. 9; Job xxxi. 38-40; *cf.* Exod. ii. 23.

o Rom. ix. 29; Rev. xviii. 5. (Sept.); *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 6. Ezek. xxxiv. 3.

p *Cf.* Job xxi. 13; Luke xvi. 19, 25; 2 Pet. ii. 13.

q Am. vi. 4

r Luke xxi. 34.

s Quoted from Jer. xii. 3; *cf.* 1 Sam. ix. 12, 13;

[1] Clamabunt *ff*.

[2] εισεληλυθασιν אKL, curss.; εισεληλυθεν A; εισεληλυθεισαν ב.

[3] Om. και A, 73, Copt.

[4] ως εν א[3]AKLב, curss.

[5] ημεραις A.

of reward, but not in that of wages due; in the same book **ἐργάτης** occurs twice (xix. 1, xl. 18), but in neither case with the meaning "agricultural labourer," which is its usual meaning in the N.T., *cf.* Matt. ix. 37, but on the other hand Luke. x 7, **ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.**—**τῶν ἀμησάντων**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T.; whatever difference of meaning there may have been originally between **ἀμᾶν** and **θερίζειν** they are used as synonyms in the Septuagint, and the same is true, according to Mayor, of classical Greek. —**τὰς χώρας ὑμῶν**: often, as here, used in the restricted sense of "fields," *cf.* for the variety of meaning which it can bear the three instances of its occurrence in Sir. x. 16, xliii. 3, xlvii. 17; for its meaning of "fields," both in singular and plural, see Luke xii. 16, xxi. 21; John iv. 35.—**ὁ ἀφυστερημένος ἀφ' ὑμῶν**: "which is kept back by you," "on your part," or as Mayor renders as an alternative, "comes too late *from* you"; the **ἀφ' ὑμῶν** is not really required, it is omitted by *ff*. The withholding of wages due was evidently a sin of frequent occurrence, see Lev. xix. 13; Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Job xxiv. 10; Mic. iii. 10; Jer. xxii. 13; Prov. iii. 27, 28; Mal. iii. 5; Sir. xxxi. (xxxiv.) 22; Tob. iv. 14.—**ἀφυστ.** only here in N.T.—**κράζει**: a thoroughly Hebraic idea which occurs several times in the O.T., *cf.* for the "crying out" of inanimate things, Gen. iv. 10; Job xxiv. 12; Ps. lxxxiv. 2; Prov. viii. 1; Lam. ii. 18; Hab. ii. 11.—**αἱ βοαὶ**: only here in N.T., *cf.* Exod. xi. 23.—**εἰς τὰ ὦτα κυρίου σαβαώθ**: quoted from Isa. v. 9; one of the many marks in this section, vv. 1-6, which suggest that it did not originally belong to the N.T.; it is certainly extraordinary that the usual Septuagint rendering, **Κύριος παντοκράτωρ** or **ὁ Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων**, is not used here; though it is true **σαβαώθ** is sometimes transliterated, it is nevertheless exceptional. "Jahwe Sabaoth" was the ancient Israelite name of Jehovah as war-god.

Ver. 5. **ἐτρυφήσατε**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T.; it occurs in Sir. xiv. 4 for the Hebrew עדן* which means "to revel," followed by ב. Luther translates: Ihr habt wohlgelebet, "Ye have lived well"; but the German word "schwelgen" so exactly describes the Greek that one wonders why he did not adopt it; the English "to revel" comes nearest to it, and this is the R.V. rendering of the word in the Sir. passage referred to. **τρυφᾶν** with its compounds is used in a good as well as in a bad sense; for the former see Ps. xxxvii. 4, 11; Isa. lv. 2, lxvi. 11; Neh. ix. 25.—**ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**: the contrast is between their enjoyment of the good things of the earth and what their lot is to be hereafter; *cf.* Luke xvi. 25, "Remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art in anguish".—**ἐσπαταλήσατε**: only elsewhere in N.T. in 1 Tim. v. 6; it occurs in Ezek. xvi. 49 of the women of Jerusalem who are compared to those of Sodom; see also Sir. xxi. 15; the compound **κατασπ.** occurs in Am. vi. 4; Prov. xxix. 21; neither the word itself nor its compound is used in a good sense, expressing as it does the living of a life of wanton self-indulgence.—**ἐθρέψατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν**: this use of **καρδία** is thoroughly Hebraic, לב being used in a very wide sense in Hebrew, *cf.* Ps. civ. 15, ". . . and bread

*This is not *biblical* Hebrew, which would be התענג (Isa. lxvi. 11), or התעזן (Neh. ix. 25); עדן occurs in the Targums, but means there "to shout for joy".

t Hos. i. 6 (Sept.).
u Luke xxi. 19; Heb. x. 36.
v 1 Thess. ii. 19.
w Matt. xxi. 33.
x Sir. vi. 19.

6. κατεδικάσατε,[1] ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον[2]· οὐκ [t]ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν.[3]

7. [u]Μακροθυμήσατε οὖν,[4] ἀδελφοί, ἕως τῆς [v]παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου. ἰδοὺ ὁ [w]γεωργὸς [x]ἐκδέχεται τὸν τίμιον καρπὸν τῆς γῆς

[1] Add et *ff*. [2] δικαιον. WH. [3] νμιν; WHmg. [4] Om. ουν *s*.

that strengtheneth man's heart" (לבב which does not differ from לב in meaning), *cf.* Jud. xix. 5.—**ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σφαγῆς**: there is something extremely significant in this quotation from Jer. xii. 3, because Jeremiah uses this expression (יום הרגה) as the day of judgment; and not only so, but this prophet had also coined a new word for Gehenna, *viz.*, "Geharêgah" = "the valley of slaughter" (Jer. vii. 32. xix. 6). These expressions—"day of slaughter" and "valley of slaughter"—belong to Jeremiah (*Enoch*, xvi. 1 quotes the expression **καὶ ἀπὸ ἡμέρας καιροῦ σφαγῆς**), and in using the words "day of slaughter" the writer of our Epistle is undoubtedly giving them the meaning that they had originally; the passage before us probably means that these luxurious livers will be revelling in self-indulgence on the very day of judgment, *cf.* our Lord's words in Luke xvii. 27 ff., "They ate, they drank . . . and the flood came and destroyed them all . . . after the same manner shall it be in the day that the Son of man is revealed". The tense **ἐθρέψατε** is in accordance with Hebrew usage of regarding a thing in the future as having already taken place; it is wholly in the prophetic style.

Ver. 6. **κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον**: this expresses what must often have taken place; the prophetical books often refer to like things; there is no reason for regarding this as some specific case of judicial murder. *Cf.* Am. ii. 6, 7, v. 12; Wisd. ii. 10 ff. The antithesis between the צדיק ("righteous") and רשע ("wicked") is a commonplace in Jewish theology.—**οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν**: the statement of fact here, instead of the interrogative as read by some authorities, is more natural, and more in accordance with the prophetical style which is so characteristic of this whole passage. This picture of patient acquiescence in ill-treatment is really a very vivid touch, for it shows, on the one hand, that the down-trodden realised the futility of resistance; on the other, that their hopes were centred on the time to come.

With the whole of this section *cf.* the words in *The first book of Clement, which is called The Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ*, 12: "The harvest is come, that the guilty may be reaped and the Judge appear suddenly and confront them with their works".

Vv. 7-11. The section 7-11 is a Christian adaptation of the earlier Jewish conception of the Messianic Era; in place of **αἱ ἐσχάται ἡμέραι** there is **ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Κυρίου**, the one a specifically Jewish, the other a specifically Christian expression; the two expressions, which represent, as it were, the titles of Jewish and Christian Eschatology respectively, are sufficient to show the difference of *venue* regarding these two sections. It is characteristic of one type of apocalyptic literature that the central figure of the Messiah is not mentioned, while another type lays great emphasis on the Messianic Personality; vv. 1-6 represents the former of these; that it contains no trace of Christian interpolation is the more remarkable in that it is utilised by a Jewish-Christian writer and is incorporated in Christian literature. The fact is additional evidence in favour of its being a quotation,—one of several which our Epistle contains. It is christianised by the addition to it of vv. 7-11, which, though interspersed with O.T. reminiscences, is specifically Christian. A similar christianising of Jewish material by adding to it is found, though on a much smaller scale, in Rev. xxii. 20, **Ἀμήν ἔρχου κύριε Ἰησοῦ**, which forms a response to the preceding **ναί, ἔρχομαι ταχύ**. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy (in *Encycl. Brit.*, art. "Midrash") discovered that the Hebrew equivalent of the words **Ἀμήν ἔρχου** (= אמן בא) indicated acrostically a primitive hymn, which still appears in all the Jewish prayer books, and is known from its opening words as *'En Kelohenu* ("There is none like our God"; see Singer's *The Authorised Daily Prayer*

[y] μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ[1] ἕως[2] λάβῃ[3] [z] πρόϊμον[4] καὶ ὄψιμον.[5] 8. μακροθυμήσατε[6] καὶ ὑμεῖς, [a] στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἡ [b] παρουσία τοῦ Κυρίου ἤγγικεν. 9. μὴ στενάζετε, ἀδελφοί,[7] κατ'

y Sir. xviii. 11; Luke viii. 15, xviii. 17. z Deut. xi. 14; Job xxix. 23; Jer. v. 24; Joel ii. 23; Zech. x. 1. *cf.* Rom. xiii. 11. a 1 Thess. ii. 16, iii. 13. b Heb. x. 25; 1 Pet. iv. 7;

[1] αυτον KL, curss., Thl.; om. Vulg., Arm.

[2] Add αν אBP, 13, rec.; add ου curss.

[3] Add νετον AKLP, curss., Pesh., rec.; add καρπον א[3] (καρπον τον א[1]), Copt.

[4] πρωιμον B[3]KL, curss. [5] Add fructum *ff*. [6] Add ουν אL, 9.

[7] Add μου A, 13, pon post; αλληλων אL, Syrr., Thl., Oec., Ti.; om. K, 15, 16.

Book, p. 167). This hymn consists of five verses of four lines each; the first word of each line in the first verse begins with א, of the second verse with מ, of the third with נ, of the fourth with ב, and of the fifth with א, thus making a four-fold repetition of the formula אמן בא (= "Amen, Come"). This formula is the short title of the hymn referred to and "is actually written instead of the hymn in the place where it is to be used after the Additional Service for the New Year, and again towards the conclusion of the additional service for the eighth day of Solemn Assembly . . ., at the end of the Feast of Tabernacles" (Taylor, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, pp. 78 ff., and see Box in *Church and Synagogue*, iii., pp. 41 ff.). The formula "Amen Bo" belonged to Jewish Eschatology, and possibly took its origin from the phrase עולם הבא (= "The age to come," a common expression for the Messianic Era); it is christianised by the Jewish-Christian writer in the Apocalypse by the addition of κύριε Ἰησοῦ, just as in the passage before us the second, obviously Christian, section vv. 7-11, is added on to the former, quite as obviously Jewish, in order to make the whole Christian.

Ver. 7. Μακροθυμήσατε οὖν: the verb, as well as the adjective, is used both of God and man, *e.g.*, Rom. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 6; it expresses the attitude of mind which is content to wait; when used of God it refers to His long-suffering towards men (*e.g.*, Sir. xviii. 11); it is possible that in the present connection this is also implied in view of ver. 9.—Perhaps οὖν was added in order to join it on to the preceding section; it is omitted by the OL MS. *s*.—ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου: see above, introductory words to this section. Παρουσία does not occur in the Septuagint, being (with τοῦ Κυρίου) specifically Christian; but with τοῦ Θεοῦ, instead of τοῦ Κυρίου, it occurs in *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Jud. xxii. 2, ἕως παρουσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης (the words are omitted in the Armenian Version).—ὁ γεωργός: *Cf.* Sir. vi. 18; *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Issach. v. 3 ff.—καρπόν: used in the sense of "produce of the soil".—ἕως λάβῃ: the context shows that the subject must be "the earth," not "the fruit," for the simple reason that the fruit is not in existence when the "former" rains descend; the great importance of the "former" rains (called both יורה and מורה) was that they moistened the earth (commencing about the month of October) after it had been hardened by the blazing summer sun, and thus enabled it to receive the seed; without the "former" rains to moisten the earth one might as well sow seed on rocks. The subject might possibly be "the husbandman" as he may be said in a certain sense to receive the rain, but the most obvious subject, and that upon which the meaning of the verse most naturally depends, is the earth.—πρόϊμον καὶ ὄψιμον: *Cf.* Deut. xi. 14, and often, יורה ומלקוש.

Ver. 8. στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας: a Hebrew idiom, סעד לב; in the O.T. mostly of strengthening the body with food.—ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Κυρίου ἤγγικεν: see above; *cf.* Matt. iii. 2; Luke xxi. 28; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 John i. 18.

Ver. 9. μὴ στενάζετε: "A strengthened expression for μὴ καταλαλεῖτε iv. 11" (Carr); it refers to the inward feeling of grudge against another. The word shows that it is not only the righteous who are addressed in this section.—

c 2 (4) Esdr. ἀλλήλων ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε[1]· ἰδοὺ ὁ [c]κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν [d]θυρῶν[2] ἕστηκεν.[3]
viii. 18; *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 5; Rev. xxii. 12.
d Matt. xxiv. 33; Mark xiii. 29; *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 5.
e John xiii. 15; Heb. iv. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 6.
f Col. i. 11.
g Matt. v. 12.
10. [e]ὑπόδειγμα[4] λάβετε,[5] ἀδελφοί,[6] τῆς κακοπαθείας[7] καὶ τῆς
μακροθυμίας[8] τοὺς [g]προφήτας, οἳ [h]ἐλάλησαν ἐν[9] τῷ[10] ὀνόματι
Κυρίου.[11] 11. ἰδοὺ [i]μακαρίζομεν τοὺς [k]ὑπομείναν-
τας[i 12]· τὴν ὑπομονὴν [l]Ἰὼβ ἠκούσατε, καὶ τὸ τέλος[13] Κυρίου εἴδετε,[14]
ὅτι [m]πολύσπλαγχνός[15] ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος[16] καὶ [n]οἰκ-
τίρμων.[m] 12. Πρὸ πάντων δέ,[17] ἀδελφοί [o]μου,[18] μὴ ὀμνύετε, μήτε
τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὅρκον· ἤτω δὲ[19] ὑμῶν τὸ

h 2 Pet. i. 21.
i Job i. 21, 22, ii. 10.
i—i *Cf.* Dan. xii. 12. See Matt. v. 10.
m—m Ps. ciii. 8, cxi. 4; *cf.* Num. xiv. 18.
k Matt. x. 22; Col. i. 11.
n Luke vi. 36.
o—o Matt. v. 34-37; *cf.* Mal. iii. 5; Heb. vi. 16.

[1] κατακριθητε ב. [2] Januam *ff*. [3] Stat *ff*. [4] Add δε ב.

[5] λαβετε . . . και της μακροθυμιας εχετε (lectio ex duabus confusa) ב; om. λαβετε A, 13, Aeth.

[6] Add μου אKL, 13, rec. [7] κακοπαθιας B[1]P, WH; καλοκαγαθιας א.

[8] Add εχετε א[3]A, 13, Aeth. [9] Om. εν AKLב, curss.

[10] Om. τω א, Chrys. [11] Pr. του ב.

[12] υπομενοντας KL ב, curss., Copt., Arm., Aeth., Thl., Oec., rec.

[13] ελεος 27, 29. [14] ιδετε AB[3]LP, curss. [15] πολυενσπλαγχνος curss., Thl.

[16] Om. ο Κυριος KL, curss.; om. ο B, WHmg, Weiss.

[17] ουν א[1]; om. K, curss. [18] Om. μου ב.

[19] Add ο λογος א*, 8, Copt., Aeth.

ὁ κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἕστηκεν: *Cf.* Rev. iii. 20. For the idea of the Judge standing at the door see Matt. xxiv. 33, . . . **γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις,** xxv. 10 ff. (the parable of the Ten Virgins). In its origin the idea is antique; *cf.* the following from the Mishna (*Ab.* iv. 16): "This world is as if it were a vestibule to the future world; prepare thyself in the vestibule, that thou mayest enter the reception-room"; this saying is one of Jacob of Korsha's who lived in the second century A.D.—**ἕστηκεν**: for the tense see above.

Ver. 10. **ὑπόδειγμα**: *Cf.* Sir. xliv. 16 and especially John xiii. 15, **ὑπόδ. ἔδωκα ὑμῖν . . .** of our Lord.—**τῆς κακοπαθείας**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T. *cf.* 4 Macc. ix. 8. It means "endurance" rather than the R.V. "suffering"; this goes better with **μακροθυμίας**, "patience". The rendering "endurance" has support from the papyri, see Deissmann, *Neue Bibelst.*, pp. 91 f.—**ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι**: although this use of the phrase is paralleled by its use in the papyri (see Deissmann, *Bibelst.*, pp. 143-5: *Neue Bibelst.*, pp. 25, 26), it is more probable that in this case it comes through the Septuagint from the Hebrew בשם; *cf.* above ii. 7.

Ver. 11. **μακαρίζομεν**: *Cf.* 4 Macc. xviii. 13, used in reference to Daniel.—**Ἰώβ**: Job occupies a high place of honour in post-biblical Jewish literature, *cf.* the pseudepigraphic work "The Testament of Job".—**τὸ τέλος Κυρίου**: the final purpose of Jehovah with regard to Job; it could not refer to Christ, for the whole passage is dealing with O.T. examples.—**πολύσπλαγχνος**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T.—**οἰκτίρμων**: only elsewhere in N.T. in Luke vi. 36; *cf.* Sir. ii. 11 and often in the Septuagint.

Ver. 12. **Πρὸ πάντων . . .**: The most natural way of understanding these words would be to take them in connection with something that immediately preceded, but as there is not the remotest connection between this verse and the section that has gone just before, this is impossible here; the verse must be regarded as the fragment of some larger piece; it is not the only instance in this Epistle of a quotation which has been incorporated, only in this case the fragmentary character is more than usually evident. That it is not a quotation from the Gospel, as we now have it (Matt. v. 33-37), must be obvious, for if it were this, it would unquestionably approximate more closely

[p] ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ κρίσιν[1] πέσητε.° 13. [q] Κακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν[2] ὑμῖν; προσευχέσθω· εὐθυμεῖ τις; [r] ψαλλέτω. 14. ἀσθενεῖ[3] τις ἐν ὑμῖν; προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς [s] πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας,[4] καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν[5] [t] ἀλείψαντες[6] ἐλαίῳ ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ

p 2 Cor. i. 17, 18.
q Ps. l. 15.
r Rom. xv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16.
s Acts xi. 30.
t Mark vi. 13; *cf.* xvi. 18.

[1] εις υποκρισιν KLP℔, curss., rec. (ed. Steph.).
[2] Ex *ff*.
[3] Pr. et *ff*.
[4] Om. της εκκλησιας *ff*.
[5] αυτους א[1].
[6] Add αυτον אAKL, curss., Treg.

to the original; on the other hand, its general similarity to the Gospel passage proves that there must be a relationship of some kind between the two. Probably both trace their origin to a saying of our Lord's which became modified in transmission, assuming various forms while retaining the essential point. An example of a similar kind can be seen by comparing together Matt. x. 26; Luke viii. 17 and the fourth of the New Oxyrhynchus Sayings: **Λέγει Ἰησοῦς Πᾶν τὸ μὴ ἔμπροσθεν τῆς ὄψεώς σου καὶ τὸ κεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ σοῦ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται καὶ τεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται** (Grenfell and Hunt's restoration). In any case the verse before us must originally have been preceded by a context which contained various precepts of which this was regarded as the most important, on account of the words **πρὸ πάντων.—μὴ ὀμνύετε . . .**: this was a precept enjoined by many of the more devout Jews; Pharisees avoided oaths as much as possible, the Essenes never swore; a very good pre-Christian example of the same precept is contained in Sir. xxiii. 9-11, **Ὅρκῳ μὴ ἐθίσῃς τὸ στόμα σου, καὶ ὀνομασίᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου μὴ συνεθισθῇς . . . ἀνὴρ πολύορκος πλησθήσεται ἀνομίας . . .—ἤτω**: *Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 22, the only other occurrence of this form in the N.T.

Ver. 13. **κακοπαθεῖ**: See note on v. 10; it refers perhaps rather to mental worry or distress, while **ἀσθενεῖ** refers to some specific bodily ailment.—**εὐθυμεῖ**; only found elsewhere in Acts xxvii. 22, 25 in the N.T.—**ψαλλέτω**: refers both to playing on a stringed instrument (Sir. ix. 4) and to singing (Eph. v. 19), and is also used of singing with the spirit (1 Cor. xiv. 15).

Ver. 14. **ἀσθενεῖ . . . προσκαλεσάσθω**, etc.: *Cf.* Sir. xxxviii. 14, **καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ Κυρίου δεηθήσονται, ἵνα εὐοδώσῃ αὐτοῖς ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ ἴασιν χάριν ἐμβιώσεως.** In regard to the practice of primitive Christianity in the matter of caring for the sick Harnack says: "Even from the fragments of our extant literature, although that literature was not written with any such intention, we can still recognise the careful attention paid to works of mercy. At the outset we meet with directions everywhere to care for sick people, 1 Thess. v. 14. . . . In the prayer of the Church, preserved in the first epistle of Clement, supplications are expressly offered for those who are sick in soul and body (1 Clem. lix., **τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς ἴασαι . . . ἐξανάστησον τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας, παρακάλεσον τοὺς ὀλιγοψυχοῦντας**). . . . Epistle of Polycarp, vi. 1; Justin Martyr, lxvii. . . ."; he also quotes Lactantius, *Div. Inst.*, vi. 12: "Aegros quoque quibus defuerit qui adsistat, curandos fovendosque suscipere summae humanitatis et magnae operationis est" (*Expansion* . . . i. 147 f. first English ed.). A like care was characteristic of the Rabbis, who declared it to be a duty incumbent upon every Jew to visit and relieve the sick whether they were Jews or Gentiles (*Git.*, 61 *a*, *Soṭah*, 14 *a*); "the *Ḥaberim*, or *Ḥasidic* associations, made the performance of this duty a special obligation" (*Jewish Encycl.*, xi. 327).—**τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας**: both the words "presbyters" (= "priest") and "ecclesia" were taken over from the Jews, being the Greek equivalents for זקנים and קהל. While, however, the word **πρεσβύτερος** was, without question, in the Christian Church taken over from the זקן in the Jewish Church, it is well to recall the extended use which attached to it according to the evidence of the papyri. The phrase **ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῆς κώμης** occurs on a papyrus belonging to the time of the Ptolemies, and is evidently an official title of some kind; **οἱ πρεσβύτεροι** is found together with **ἱερεῖς** of an idola-

u *Cf.* Acts ix. 40, xxviii. 8, and see Matt. ix. 2.
v Matt. ix. 21, 22.
w Is. xxxiii. 24; Mark ii. 5; Luke v. 20; *cf.* 1 Jn. v. 16.

Κυρίου.[1] 15. καὶ ἡ εὐχὴ[2] τῆς [w]πίστεως [v]σώσει τὸν κάμνοντα, καὶ ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος· κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ[3] [v]πεποιηκώς, ἀφεθήσεται[4]

[1] Om. του Κυριου BA, Orig., Tregm.; ιω χυ 6. WH place it in brackets.
[2] προσευχη P, curss. [3] ην ב. [4] αφεθησονται P, 7.

trous worship (c. 40 B.C.); and in the second century A.D. οἱ πρεσβύτεροι occurs in reference to "elders" of villages in Egypt. The Septuagint translators were therefore probably using in this case a word which had a well-known technical sense. Deissmann believes it possible, therefore, that the Christian congregations of Asia Minor got the title of πρεσβύτερος from the minor officials who were so called, and not necessarily from the Jewish prototype (*Op. cit.*, pp. 153 f.). This might well be the case in various centres, though not all (as for example, Babylonia), of the Diaspora, but not in Palestine. It is, of course, an open question as to whether our Epistle was written from Palestine or not; see, further, Deissmann (*Neue Bibelst.* pp. 60 ff.). As regards ἐκκλησία, Harnack remarks that "originally it was beyond question a collective term (*i.e.*, קָהָל); it was the most solemn expression of the Jews for their worship as a collective body, and as such it was taken over by the Christians. But ere long it was applied to the individual communities, and then again to the general meeting for worship. . . . Its acquisition rendered the capture of the term 'synagogue' a superfluity, and once the inner cleavage had taken place, the very neglect of the latter title served to distinguish Christians sharply from Judaism and its religious gatherings even in terminology. . . . Most important of all, however, was the fact that ἐκκλησία was conceived of, in the first instance, not simply as an earthly but as a heavenly and transcendental entity" (*op. cit.*, pp. 11 ff.); "קָהָל (usually rendered ἐκκλησία in LXX) denotes the community in relation to God, and consequently is more sacred than the profaner עֵדָה (regularly translated by συναγωγή in the LXX). . . . Among the Jews ἐκκλησία lagged far behind συναγωγή in practical use, and this was all in favour of the Christians and their adoption of the term" (*ibid.*). In the verse before us it is the combination of these two terms, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας which points to a developed organisation among the communities of the Diaspora, and therefore to a late date for this part of the Epistle. —ἀλείψαντες ἐλαίῳ: a common Jewish usage, see Isa. i. 6; Mark vi. 13; Luke x. 34. As oil was believed to have the effect of curing bodily sickness, so it became customary to use it preparatory to Baptism, possibly with the idea of its healing, sacramentally, the disease of sin; that it was joined to Baptism as an integral part of the sacrament is certain. Prayer was, of course, an indispensable accompaniment. —ἐν ὀνόματι . . .: *Cf.* Mark xvi. 17; Luke x. 17; Acts iii. 6, 16, iv. 10, xvi. 18; and on the formula, the note above, ii. 17.

Ver. 15. ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως: *Cf.* Matt. xxi. 22.—σώσει: for this sense *cf.* Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 23; John xi. 12.—κάμνοντα: in this sense only here in the N.T., though it is used in a somewhat similar sense in Hebrew xii. 3. —ἐγερεῖ: it seems most natural to take this as referring to the sick man being raised up from his bed of sickness, though the use of κάμνειν in Heb. xii. 3 suggests the possibility of spiritual comfort being also included.—ὁ Κύριος: this must probably refer to Christ, though the O.T. reference in the context would justify the contention that Jahwe is meant.—κἂν: *Cf.* Mark xvi. 18; Luke xiii. 9, as showing that this does not necessarily mean "even if". —ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ: *Cf.* Sir. xxxviii. 9, 10, Τέκνον, ἐν ἀρρωστήματί σου μὴ παράβλεπε, ἀλλ' εὖξαι Κυρίῳ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἰάσεταί σε· ἀπόστησον πλημμελίαν καὶ εὔθυνον χεῖρας, καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας καθάρισον καρδίαν; The Jewish belief on this subject may be illustrated by the following: in *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Simeon, ii. 11 ff., because Simeon continued wrathful against Reuben, he says, "But the Lord restrained me, and withheld from me the power of my hands; for my right hand was half withered for seven days"; in Gad. v. 9 ff. the patriarch confesses that owing to his hatred against Joseph God brought upon

αὐτῷ. 16. [x] ἐξομολογεῖσθε οὖν[1] ἀλλήλοις τὰς ἁμαρτίας,[2] καὶ προσ- εύχεσθε[3] ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, ὅπως [y] ἰαθῆτε.[4] πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου [z] ἐνεργουμένη. 17. [a] Ἠλείας[5] ἄνθρωπος ἦν ὁμοιοπαθὴς ἡμῖν, καὶ προσευχῇ [b] προσηύξατο τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι, καὶ οὐκ ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐνιαυτοὺς [c] τρεῖς καὶ μῆνας ἕξ· 18. καὶ[6] πάλιν [d] προσηύξατο, καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ὑετὸν ἔδωκεν[7] καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐβλάστησεν τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς.

x Sir. iv. 26, y Matt. xiii. 15; Luke iv. 18; Heb. xii. 13. z 2 Cor. i. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1; *cf.* Gen. xviii. 23-32; Jn. ix. 31; Acts viii. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 12. a 1 Kgs. xvii. 1, xviii. 1; Acts xiv. 15. b *Cf.* Sir. xlviii. 2, 3; Luke xxii. 15; Rev. xi. 6. c Luke iv. 25. d 1 Kgs. xviii. 42, 45; 2 (4) Esdr. vii. 39.

[1] Om. L, curss., *ff*, Arm., Aeth.; δε 107, Pesh.

[2] τα παραπτωματα KL, curss., Pesh., Orig., Thl., Oec.; add υμων L, 69, *a*, *c*, *ff*, Vulg., Syrr., Copt., Aeth.

[3] ευχεσθε א KLP, curss., Thl., Oec., Treg., Ti., WH (altern. reading).

[4] Ut remittatur vobis *ff*. [5] Ηλιας א AB[3] KLP, curss.

[6] Sed *ff*. [7] εδωκεν υετον A, 13, 73, Latt., Treg., Ti., WH[mg],; εδ. τον υετ. א.

him a disease of the liver, "and had not the prayers of Jacob my father succoured me, it had hardly failed but my spirit had departed". That sin brings disease was, likewise in the later Jewish literature, an article of faith, indeed here one finds specified what are the particular sicknesses that particular sins bring in their train. According to Rabbinical teaching there are four signs by means of which it is possible to recognise the sin of which a man has been guilty: dropsy is the sign that the sin of fornication has been committed, jaundice that of unquenchable hatred, poverty and humiliation that of pride, liver complaint (?) (אסכרה) that of back-biting. In *Shabbath*, 55 *a*, it says: "No death without sin, no chastisement without evil-doing," and in *Nedarim*, 41 *a* it says: "No recovery without forgiveness". Leprosy may be due to one of eleven sins, but most probably to that of an evil tongue (see Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 245 f.).

Ver. 16. **ἐξομολογεῖσθε . . . ἁμαρτίας**: see critical note above. Confession of sins has always played an important part in Judaism; the O.T. word for confession of sins is תורה,* the later term, which denotes more particularly the liturgical form of confession, is ווידוי. Private as well as public confession was enjoined, and many forms of confession, both general and particular, exist, among others one for the sick; it was the duty of the Rabbis to urge the sick person to confess his sins. Confession is regarded as a meritorious act: according to *Sanhedrin*, 103 *a*, it has the effect of enabling the worst sinners to inherit everlasting life (see, among other authorities, Hamburger's *Realencycl. des Judent*, article "Sündenbekenntniss".). For the custom of the early Church *cf.* *Didache*, iv. 14, xiv. 1.—**προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων**: the need of intercessory prayer is strongly emphasised in O.T., N.T. and the later Jewish literature, see above and the next note.—**πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη**: one is reminded of the well-known instance of Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai (end of first century, A.D.) who, when in need of the prayers of a righteous man on behalf of his sick child, said, "Although I am greater in learning than Chaninah, he is more efficacious in prayer; I am, indeed, the Prince, but he is the steward who has constant access to the King" (*Berachoth*, 34 *b*). A curious saying of Rabbi Isaac is contained in *Jebamoth*, 64 *a*: "The prayer of the righteous is comparable to a pitchfork; as the pitchfork changes the position of the wheat so the prayer changes the disposition of God from wrath to mercy" (quoted in *Jewish Encycl.*, x. 169). With **δικαίου** *cf.* **δίκαιον** in ver. 6. On **ἐνεργουμένη** see Mayor's elaborate note.

Ver. 17. **Ἠλείας**; Elijah plays an immense part in the later Jewish literature, see Hamburger, *op. cit.*, article "Elias". With his mention here *cf.* Sir. xlviii. 1 ff.—**προσευχῇ προσηύξατο**: Hebraism *cf.* Luke xxii. 15; John iii. 29, etc., etc.

Ver. 18. With this and the preceding

* This word is sometimes used as meaning *praise* given to God by the act of confession of sins, *cf.* Ryle, *Ezra . . .*, p. 132.

e—e *Cf.* Gal. vi. 1.
f Matt. xviii. 15.
g Ps. li. 13 (15 in Heb.); Mal. ii. 6; *cf.* Prov. xi. 30.

19. e Ἀδελφοί μου,[1] ἐάν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς[2] ἀληθείας καὶ f ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτόν,e 20. γινώσκετε ὅτι[3] ὁ g ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ[4] h σώσει[5] [6]ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐκ θανάτου[6] καὶ k καλύψει[7] πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.[8]

h Rom. xi. 14; *cf.* xiii. 9. i Acts xxvii. 37. k *Cf.* Prov. x. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 8, and see Ps. xxxii. 1, lxxxv. 2; Rom. iv. 7.

[1] Om. L, curss., Did., Oec., rec. [2] Add **οδου της** א, 5, Pesh., Copt.

[3] **γινωσκετω οτι** אAKLP, Treg., Ti., WHmg; om. *ff*, Sah.

[4] Om. *ff*. [5] Salvat *ff*, Orig.; salvavit Vulgg.

[6—6] **την ψυχην** A, 73, Arm.; om. **αυτου** KL, curss., Sah., Orig., Thl., Oec., Treg.; pon **αυτου** post **θαν.** B, *ff*, Aeth., Weiss, WHmg.

[7] **καλυπτει** Vulg., Orig., Dam. [8] Peccati *ff*; add **αμην** 40.

Subscr. **ιακωβου** B; **επιστολη ιακωβου** א; **ιακωβου επιστολη** A, 40, 67, 177; **ιακωβου αποστολου επιστολη καθολικη** P, 63; **τελος του αγιου αποστολου ιακωβου επιστολη καθολικη** L; **τελος της επιστολης του αγιου αποστολου ιακωβου του αδελφοθεου** 38, explicit epistola Jacobi filii Zaebedei *ff*; most MSS. have no subscr.

verse *cf. Ta'anith*, 24 *b*, where we are told of how Rabbi Chaninah, on being caught in a shower of rain, prayed: "Master of the Universe, the whole world is pleased, while Chaninah alone is annoyed"; then the rain immediately ceased. On arriving home he prayed: "Master of the Universe, shall all the world be grieved while Chaninah enjoys his comfort?" Whereupon the rain came down again (see *Jewish Encycl.*, vi. 215).

Ver. 19. **πλανηθῇ**: "The passive aorist is used with a middle force in classical writers, as well as in the LXX, Deut. xxxii. 1; Ps. cxix. 176; Ezek. xxxiv. 4" (Mayor).—**ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας**: *Cf.* Mark xii. 14, . . . **ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις**, this seems to be the way in which **ἀληθεία** is here used, *cf.* John iii. 21, v. 33; viii. 32.—**ἐπιστρέψῃ**: excepting here (and in the next verse) and Luke i. 16, 17 this word is always used intransitively in the N.T. (*cf.* however Acts xxvi. 18).

Ver. 20. **γινώσκετε**: taking this as an indicative one may regard the words that follow as a quotation, a course which commends itself owing to the comparatively large number of quotations with which the Epistle abounds; at the same time it must be remembered that the weight of MS. evidence is in favour of **γινωσκέτω**.—**καλύψει . . .** (Hebrew כִּסָּה) *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 8, one of the strongest of the many marks of Jewish authorship which the Epistle contains; according to Jewish doctrine good works balance evil ones; the good work of converting a sinner is reckoned here as one of the most efficacious in obliterating evil deeds; on the whole subject see Introduction IV., § 2.

ABERDEEN: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

FOR
REFERENCE
Not to be
taken from
this library

NYACK COLLEGE - MANHATTAN